

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAEANAE





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/Leenders1967>

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

ASPECTS OF TIME IN
LEONOV'S DOROGA NA OKEAN

by

(C)

MARIJKE LEENDERS

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF SLAVONIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SEPTEMBER, 1967

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have
read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate
Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled
"Aspects of Time in Leonov's Doroga na okean"
submitted by Marijke Leenders in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for the degree
of Master of Arts.

ABSTRACT
of
ASPECTS OF TIME IN LEONOV'S DOROGA NA OKEAN

There are two basic approaches which may be distinguished in the field of literary criticism, namely, extrinsic and intrinsic criticism. Extrinsic criticism examines a work of art, in this case Leonov's Doroga na okean, in terms of external data, for example, the society in which it took form, the particular century or the particular political conditions under which it was created. This approach offers a study of the author's life, his thoughts, or the historical or political milieu which is thought to be mirrored in the literary work of art. Previous criticism of Leonov's novel assumes that it is largely devoted to the political and ideological aims as formulated in the principles of socialist realism.

Intrinsic criticism, on the other hand, looks for the qualities which distinguish one work of art from another. It attempts to analyze the text for its materials and structure conveyed through the medium of language. Criticism of this sort investigates the language, narrative devices, the theme, and the characterization of the materials found within the scope of the novel.

Leonov's Doroga has a complex temporal and thematic structure. This feature has not been examined in any considerable depth in the past. Although the above elements are noted by a number of critics, they are seldom related to the remainder of the novel.

These two time planes are a vital part of the whole temporal and thematic structure. The flashbacks clarify the relationships between the numerous characters and the motivation for their behavior in the action of the present. The terms doroga and okean, in their concrete meanings of "railroad" and the geographic location "Ocean," respectively, unify the novel in this sense. In their more abstract meaning of "way of life" and "utopia" they also integrate the intersecting sujet lines of human life portrayed on all three levels. Ocean is thus defined as a means of wish fulfilment for that which Kurilov could not attain in the present, i.e. an escape from death. Since a wish, which exists in the present, takes its form from the past, and is passed down to future generations, the concept "Ocean" is integrated in the temporal structure of the novel and functional in it.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank my supervisor, Mr. G. Schaarschmidt, for his advice and consideration concerning the content and style of this thesis. I also wish to express my gratitude to my friends for their continual support and encouragement during the writing of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
Introduction	1
I THE EXTRINSIC APPROACH	3
1) Biographical Framework	5
2) Intentional Framework	8
3) "Quasi-theoretical" Framework	11
II TOWARDS AN INTRINSIC STUDY OF <u>DOROGA NA OKEAN</u>	21
1) Language	21
2) Narrative Devices	25
3) Characterization	31
4) Theme	37
5) Image of Ocean	40
III THE <u>RAISON D'ETRE</u> OF THE PAST	46
1) The Narrator	48
2) Unobtrusive Introduction of Characters	54
3) Flashback	60
IV THE FUNCTION OF OCEAN	68
1) The Significance of <u>Doroga</u> <u>na okean</u>	68
2) The Relationships of the Oceanic Chapters to the Novel	71
Conclusion	85
BIBLIOGRAPHY	89

ASPECTS OF TIME IN LEONOV'S DOROGA NA OKEAN

Introduction

The first part of this thesis examines previous research on Doroga na okean¹. in an effort to present an analytical account of the type of criticism that has been applied to the novel, and what it has accomplished. The critical analyses are divided into two sections: 1) extrinsic criticism, i.e. the study of the environment that is more or less overtly reflected in a literary work of art, such as the biographical, the intentional, and the historical approach, and 2) intrinsic criticism, i.e. those studies which attempt to go beyond the investigations in section (1) and examine the work in itself, or at least exhibit elements of this approach. The latter approach provides the background to the interpretative analysis in Chapters III and IV which was done by the writer of this thesis.

The topic for discussion in Chapters III and IV is the inclusive character of the past and the visionary future temporal planes in the novel. Some critics have claimed that these elements have been emphasized too much, or bear little or no relation to the novel as a

¹L. Leonov, Sobranie sochinenii, Vol. VI (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1961). The novel will henceforth be referred to as Doroga.

whole. In an attempt to refute this argument, Chapters III and IV study the narrative devices in relation to these two time planes and attempt to show the manner in which these contribute to, and complement, the depiction of the present. Chapter III will also attempt to present some arguments in favor of the raison d'être of Doroga as a work of art.

This part of the thesis will endeavor, moreover, to show the substantiation of a claim made by a Western critic, that the visionary future is an essential part of Doroga. It is hoped that the study of the three utopian chapters in terms of terminology and character relationships will adequately prove their inclusive and complementary nature in the novel.

CHAPTER I

THE EXTRINSIC APPROACH

The majority of existing interpretations of Doroga na okean are primarily concerned with investigating the relationship between the work itself and some external elements, such as biographical data about the author, his intention in writing the work, or the influence of some school, stylistic trend, or prescriptive method, such as socialist realism in the given case. This sort of analysis extracts meaning from the text only in so far as this may be corroborated by factual evidence. The extrinsic approach thus consists basically in isolating certain elements in the novel and drawing parallels between them and biographical, historical, or political data. The latter has clearly been the focus of attention of most analysts, both Soviet and Western, of Leonov's novel, particularly with regard to its elements of political and moral didacticism. As an extreme application of this framework, the aesthetic value of the novel has been minimized or even ignored by critics who consider it a mere piece of propaganda.¹

¹ See, e.g., H. Muchnic, From Gorky to Pasternak, London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1961, pp. 180-185.

Hugh McLean, in his article "The Development of Modern Russian Literature," states that the essence of literature consists of a hierarchy of three functions (aesthetic, cognitive, and didactic), and attempts to establish the shifting emphasis on one or the other of these functions throughout the various periods of Russian literature from the 18th century to the present day Soviet era.² In his view, contemporary Soviet literature is marked by maximum emphasis on the didactic function, due to the particular political environment in which it is created.

A somewhat different view is taken by Struve who, while noting the emphasis on didacticism in Soviet literature, points out that the quality of Soviet literary works is not wholly negligible. He states that:

Though the aesthetic function of literature in Soviet Russia has been subordinated to the didactic and pseudo-cognitive one, and ever since the advent of socialist realism all but suppressed, it has shown signs of breaking through whenever there was a chance.³ Leonov is a good example of its vitality.

However, Struve, too, places the instructive aspect of Soviet literature above its artistic merits.⁴ He fails to explain what features exactly give Leonov's work its vitality.

²H. McLean, "The Development of Modern Russian Literature," Slavic Review, Vol. XXI (1962), pp. 389-410.

³G. Struve, "The Aesthetic Function in Russian Literature," Slavic Review, Vol. XXI (1962), p. 425.

⁴Ibid., pp. 418-427.

In the first chapter of this thesis the various forms of extrinsic criticism of Doroga will be examined, with particular reference to the fallacies that are characteristic of this approach. The second chapter will be devoted to the structural analysis, or elements of a structural analysis of the novel Doroga na okean.

1. Biographical Framework

A most common practice of literary critics is to extract biographical data from the work and to draw conclusions about the author's life or, reversing this procedure, a body of known facts about the writer is used as a basis for interpreting the text. The application of this framework, in either of its forms, tends to negate the most durable and permanent part of the literary process, the literary text, by concentrating on the vague and undefined notion of the "author." While the "author" may be considered simply the creator of a work of art, the final product is clearly an entity in itself and should be judged on its own merits. For the purpose of an intrinsic analysis of a work of literature it seems best to distinguish, in the words of Wellek and Warren, "between the empirical person and the work, which can be called 'personal' only in a metaphorical sense."⁵.

⁵R. Wellek and A. Warren, Theory of Literature (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1964), p. 79.

In dealing with literature, therefore, a critic must logically concern himself with the given text structure in all of its aspects, linguistic and otherwise.

In several critical studies of Doroga, Leonov is identified with some of the characters in the novel or with the narrator. Most typically, in analyses of this kind a one-to-one relationship is established between the narrator of the story and the author himself. This is particularly the case in those chapters in which the third person narrative shifts to the first person narrative.⁶. In one instance, for example, Kurilov's ideological evolution is correlated with Leonov's supposed ideological shift in the thirties.⁷. In another, the author is identified with Liza, who is said to symbolize Leonov's hope of being forever freed from suffering.⁸. In order to substantiate its findings, this type of criticism must assume a direct relation between the author and his characters and between life and fiction. It is assumed, therefore, that since the author wrote the novel, he must have put something of his own self into each of his characters, and that this "something" should

⁶This is found in V. Kovalev, Romany Leonida Leonova (Moskva; Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1954), p. 344; also in Muchnic, From Gorky, p. 295; Z. Boguslavskaya, Leonid Leonov (Moskva: Sovetskii pisatel', 1960), p. 235.

⁷B. Iasenskii, "Ideinyi rost khudozhinika," Literaturaia gazeta, No. 27 (590) (1936).

⁸Boguslavskaya, Leonov, p. 244.

in some way be recovered by the critic. Such a conclusion assumes a simple cause and effect relationship between life and the final literary product, without taking into consideration how these experiences are interpreted by the artist himself, and how they are reportrayed in his work.⁹.

Other critics attempt to recover the author's feelings at the time of writing the novel, claiming for example, that they can sense the "emotion and the responsibility felt by the writer during the years of writing Doroga na okean" on the basis of speeches made by Leonov in 1933.¹⁰ It seems clear that such critical observations deny in fact the at least partly fictional character of the novel.

Not one of the cited examples of criticism, pertaining to the biographical framework, could be called a study devoted in its entirety to biography. Generally speaking, only elements of this fallacy were found scattered throughout the critical analyses of the novel. The result of such biographical digressions are more or less irrelevant statements about the author or about the genesis of the text. Little, if any, contribution is made by these statements to an interpretation of the work itself.

⁹ See, e.g., Wellek and Warren, Theory of Literature, where the authors argue convincingly about this viewpoint in relation to Shakespeare.

¹⁰ Boguslavskia, Leonov, p. 235.

2. Intentional Framework

Another type of critical study focuses mainly on the intentions of the author by examining what is said in the text. Intention, as defined by Wimsatt and Beardsley, "is the design or plan in the author's mind. It has obvious affinities for the author's attitude towards his work, the way he felt, what made him write."¹¹ Within this framework of reference the critic assumes that it is possible to deduce the author's intentions from evidence, direct or indirect, in the text itself. Many such critical studies are concerned with the discovery of Leonov's artistic intention in questions of content and character portrayal. In other words, such elements as content and character portrayal are explained in terms of an unknown, external entity, rather than in terms of a theory that tries to account for their systemic character.

It is to be expected that such an approach cannot go beyond the most trivial statements, such as that the novel was intended to be a glorification of communism and of its achievements,¹² or that the author's aim was to depict the inner world of the active builders of the

¹¹ W. K. Wimsatt, Jr., and M. C. Beardsley, "The Intentional Fallacy," Essays in Modern Literary Criticism, ed. R. B. West, Jr. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1962), p. 175.

¹² See, e.g., Kovalev, Romany, P. 377; and Muchnic, From Gorky, pp. 294-295.

new society and their dreams and hopes about the future.^{13.}

Kovalev singles out two specific themes of the novel in an attempt to explain the author's artistic intentions. He asserts that the theme of Ocean reflects the author's prophetic message concerning the development of technology and man's invasion of space as well as his visions of the prolonging of life and the conquering of disease.^{14.} Leonov's aim with regard to the portrayal of the past is seen to be two-fold: firstly, to show the bankruptcy of the bourgeois class, and secondly, to find some psychological source for the frame of mind of hostile elements in the society.^{15.}

Another fairly typical example of the intentional framework of literary criticism is Simmons' interpretation of an incident involving the Soviet theatre. In the course of a conversation at Liza's home about acting and the state of the theatre, Liza is upbraided for having no acting ability and for owing her position as an actress to her husband's influential position. Simmons describes the

¹³ Istoriia russkoi sovetskoi literatury, Vol. II (Moskva; Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 1963), p. 558; Russkaia sovetskaia literatura (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe uchebno-pedagogicheskoe izdatel'stvo ministerstva prosveshcheniya RSFSR, 1963), p. 358; A. M. Startseva, "Osobennosti kompozitsii romanov L. Leonova," Voprosy sovetskoi literatury, ed. P. S. Vakhodtseva and V. A. Kovalev (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1959), p. 393; V. Kovalev, "Tvorcheskii put' Leonida Leonova," L. Leonov, Sobranie sochinenii, I, p. 35.

¹⁴ V. Kovalev, Tvorchestvo Leonida Leonova (Moskva; Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1962), pp. 81, 113.

¹⁵ Kovalev, Romany, p. 351.

whole scene as being obviously employed by Leonov "to satirize the prevailing abuses of the Soviet theater."¹⁶.

There appears to be a variety of conflicting viewpoints in the critical analyses of Leonov's intention, particularly with respect to character depiction. Several critics, for example, claim that Kurilov was intended to have great influence in his relations with other people.¹⁷ To others, Kurilov was not designed to be a knight in shining armor.¹⁸ The fact that Kurilov seems to be a tragic figure (he dies of cancer at the peak of his powers) is regarded by some critics as being contrary to the author's intention.¹⁹ It is clearly implied by such statements that the data of the text itself become meaningful only if they are tied to some more or less hypothetical intention or plan on the part of the author. However, since the author's intentions cannot be easily verified in most instances, the resulting interpretations are not subject to truth tests either. And even where evidence about the author's plan exists, it must still be considered as being extraneous to the work itself.

¹⁶ E. J. Simmons, Russian Fiction and Soviet Ideology (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958), p. 129.

¹⁷ See, e.g., A. Selivanovskii, V literaturnykh boiakh (Moskva: Sovetskii pisatel', 1963), p. 287.

¹⁸ B. Brainina, "Roman o doroze v sotsializm," Kniga i proletarskaia revolutsiia, No. 7 (1936), p. 141.

¹⁹ See, e.g., Simmons, Russian Fiction, p. 126.

3. "Quasi-theoretical" Framework

When the principles of socialist realism were officially set down, the didactic function of literature was given precedence over the aesthetic. The external criteria imposed upon literature in 1934 are still retained as the basic tenets of socialist realism today.²⁰

This credo was to serve as a basis on which all literary works were to be modelled. After the proclamation of socialist realism as the exclusive literary "theory," a large number of books were written in accordance with these demands. These works were in turn subjected to a form of criticism that strove to establish the deviance from, or conformity with, the tenets of the theory on the one hand, and the currently valid interpretation of "reality" on the other. As a result, Soviet criticism was forced to move in a closed circle, since it worked with a theory that did not have any other function except that of "systematizing empirical generalizations already known."²¹ This feature alone justifies the term "quasi-theory," since individual literary works are made to fit the "theory" (i.e. credo) rather than the reverse: the modification of the theory in accordance with

²⁰ G. L. Abramovich, Vvedenie v literaturovedenie (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe uchebno-pedagogicheskoe izdatel'stvo ministerstva prosveshcheniya RSFSR, 1961), pp. 365-389.

²¹ See R. B. Braithwaite, Scientific Explanation (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1960), p. 76.

new insights gained by applying it.

The criticism most often pronounced, in this case with regard to Leonov's novel, has been the lack of a "positive" hero, the failure to depict the action of the fictive present, the "unreal" nature of the book.²² It should be noted that this schematic approach, which had its climax in the years after World War II, is still the dominant type of literary criticism in the Soviet Union today. Nevertheless, there are clear signs of a re-orientation in Soviet criticism, particularly in the area of form. Since the late fifties, a gradual change towards a more text-oriented evaluation has been taking place in the field of Soviet literary criticism. The critics Shcherbina, Motyleva, Kuznetsov, and Kozhinov are some of the spokesmen of this new approach to literary criticism in the Soviet Union.²³.

One more recent example of this re-orientation is Vlasov's attempt to soothe Gorky's negative remarks about Leonov's Doroga. Vlasov calls these remarks "unexpected" and something that even today can find no

²² See, e.g., M. Gor'kii, Sobranie sochinenii Vol. XXX (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudo-zhestvennoi literatury, 1955), p. 399; R. Messer, "Doroga na okean," Literaturnoe obozrenie, No. 7 (1936), pp. 20-21; V. Pertsov, Pisatel' i novaia deistvitel'nost' (Moskva: Sovetskii pisatel', 1958), pp. 169-172.

²³ G. Schaarschmidt, "Interior Monologue and Soviet Literary Criticism," Canadian Slavonic Papers, Vol. VIII (1966), p. 148.

explanation.²⁴ In other words, what Vlasov is saying is in fact to evaluate the novel for what it is rather than what previous critics have wanted it to be. One cannot help but see an important step towards a more intrinsic type of criticism in these remarks by Vlasov.

However, it is still a general characteristic of Soviet and Western Marxist critics that they do not look beyond the obvious political and historical implications. They ignore the aesthetic nature of literature, and substitute in its place socio-historical and political criteria. They are still under the influence of critics such as Fox and Comfort, two Western representatives of this attitude, who insist upon the indivisibility of a work of art from the society in which the artist lives.²⁵ Fox states it quite clearly when he says that "without Marxism, there is no approach to the essential truth which is the chief concern of the writer," and that "Marxism must be the writer's way of perceiving and knowing the real world."²⁶

For the purpose of this discussion the external framework of socialist realism may be conveniently subdivided into three categories: theme, characterization, and form.

²⁴ F. Kh. Vlasov, Epos muzhestva (Moskva: Moskovskii rabochii, 1965), pp. 451-452.

²⁵ See, e.g., A. Comfort, The Novel and Our Time (London: Phoenix House Limited, 1948), p. 9.

²⁶ R. Fox, The Novel and the People (New York: International Publishers, 1945), pp. 32-33.

A. Theme:

An important criterion in extraneous analyses of Doroga is the theme of the novel. The term "theme" is usually left undefined and appears to be used quite loosely in the sense of "sujet," i.e. the dominant feature of separate sections of the novel. Much less often is it used in the sense of a device that gives a work its unity. Kovalev points out the existence of different themes in the novel, such as the family, Soviet youth, the past, and the future.²⁷

Of all critical treatments of the theme of the work, very few have been positive. In a number of analyses, Leonov has been reproached for omitting some standard clichés, such as showing Kurilov at work,²⁸ or depicting a reorganization of the railroad.²⁹ In other critical analyses he is blamed for paying too much attention to details in the depiction of the past, while trying to depict the present.³⁰ Pertsov considers the first railroad accident an incident that should have been emphasized more by the writer. He states that Leonov's attention should have been focused more on the story of the bandazhik

²⁷ Kovalev, Romany, pp. 320, 328, 345, 341-344.

²⁸ Gor'kii, Sobranie sochinenii, p. 399.

²⁹ Pertsov, Pisatel', p. 170

³⁰ Ibid., p. 169.

than on the history connected with Pokhvisnev's bundle.³¹. It should be noted at this point that a further analysis of the novel points to the functional nature of this seemingly unrelated object: it leads the way to Pokhvisnev's entire history and further development and to a multitude of other characters and episodes. A further description of the bandazhik might perhaps have appealed to the railroad engineer or other technician, but for the story itself it would have been of little value.

Another aspect of Doroga which is often criticized is the fact that the image of Ocean, or as Selivanovskii puts it, the "historical lag" in the novel, is not convincing.³². According to the critic, this fault may be remedied as follows:

In order to create an effect which will truly stimulate the reader, the artist must master the bases of contemporary culture. He must be a good politician, and he must also understand the theory behind war, the atomic theory, etc. ...In any case, the success of the utopia is decided by the understanding of the present.³³.

This straightforward recipe reflects the critic's misunderstanding of the very essence and function of literature, viz., that while it is fictional, it may, nonetheless, appear to be "real." To compare, as

³¹ Pertsov, Pisatel', p. 172.

³² Selivanovskii, V literaturnykh boiakh, p. 285. See also Messer, "Doroga," pp. 20-21.

³³ Selivanovskii, V literaturnykh boiakh, p. 295.

Selivanovskii does in an earlier statement, Leonov's novel to the works of Plato, Moore, and Fourier, means, in effect, a reduction of Doroga to nothing more than a political treatise. It will be shown later in this thesis that the novel is certainly more than that.

The above approach is not only typical of Soviet criticism, however. A well-known Western critic of Russian and Soviet Russian literature writes the following about Leonov's novels:

All conform to the formula of Socialist Realism, "national in content, socialist in form." All deal with the trials, the hardships, the fortitude, and the triumph of Russian patriots. All "look into the future," all end happily...

In short, they are eminently satisfactory to Soviet officialdom; optimistic, patriotic, and sufficiently detached from dangerous controversy to insure Leonov's own safety and popularity. What is obviously lacking in them is artistic inspiration and a critical sense of literary values.³⁴

One wonders about the usage and the meaning of the clichés "national in content" and "socialist in form" as used by the Western critic, as well as the basis for such criticism. Generalizations of this kind fail to take into account the specific content and the distinctive features of each of Leonov's novels. Furthermore, the statement concerning the lack of "artistic inspiration" and of "literary values" is as vague as it is meaningless; the study of Doroga in the second part of this thesis will point out several features that may serve to refute these generalizations.

³⁴ Muchnic, From Gorky, p. 294.

B. Characterization:

Another frequent point of discussion in the analyses of Leonov's Doroga is the portrayal of the characters with the emphasis usually placed on the "type." None of these character studies attempt to go beyond the limits set by the credo of socialist realism, but merely reiterate the required formula. The result is an analysis in terms of desirable traits in a character, i.e., typicalness, positiveness, all reflected in an atmosphere of work. Seen from this angle, Kurilov, the central figure in Leonov's novel, fails to meet practically all the requirements set down in the principles of socialist realism; he is not the embodiment of the typical man, nor is he human in his feelings and relationship with people.³⁵ Moreover, he cannot be considered much of a "positive" hero, since he likes being by himself and spends more time day-dreaming than actually doing any work.³⁶ The conclusions drawn by critics with regard to the credibility of some of the figures in the novel, fail to take account of the setting and the scope of the text. Such conclusions are clearly based on some external reality, rather than on the fictive present of the work, which is its only reality in terms of literary theory.

³⁵ For example, Gor'kii, Sobranie sochinenii, p. 400; Selivanovskii, V literaturnykh boiakh, p. 287.

³⁶ Selivanovskii, V literaturnykh boiakh, p. 290. See also Pertsov, Pisatel', pp. 170-173; and M. Serebrianskii, "Doroga na okean," Literaturnaia gazeta, No. 24 (587) (1936).

C. Form:

Out of the three structural elements under discussion, form is by all means the most neglected one.³⁷. Since the tenets of socialist realism require that the form of a literary work be marked by simplicity and clarity, it is easy to see why Doroga had to be considered a failure particularly in this area. Its language, and its peculiar spatial and temporal arrangement, were considered far too complex to be recommended to the plain reading needs of Soviet man. With pragmatic considerations such as these, there was naturally no need for a framework that could deal adequately with complexity of structure, narrative devices, and their function in the novel.³⁸.

Gor'kii pointed out a whole series of faults, such as the irregular and jerky development of the plot, the overabundance of detail which to him seemed to disrupt the smooth flow of the text, the use of awkward expressions, such as posticharil spichki (he struck a match), ideinyi (idealistic), and vodopadnye usy (cascading mustache). But most of all, Gor'kii objected to certain passages in the novel that, according to him, might be incorrectly interpreted by different people who

³⁷ See, e.g., Gor'kii, Sobranie sochinenii, p. 399.

³⁸ For a somewhat more objective attempt to deal with this complexity, see Vlasov, Epos muzhestva, pp. 345-550,

read the novel.³⁹ Other criticisms include Leonov's choice of epithets, his verbal ornamentalism, which is said to make the content unreal.⁴⁰ It must be said at this point that a procedure that consists in isolating one or two sentences or words from the work cannot explain the relation that might exist between them and the situation in which they are used; it merely serves to single out some possible connotations that these elements might have for a certain body of readers. And it may be argued that this task might be carried out more adequately by a psychologist or sociologist than by an analyst of verbal art.

Conclusion

There is no question that the novel Doroga indeed reflects historical and political aspects of the environment in which it was written. Literary historians and experts in political science are at liberty to look for these elements in the novel, although they might find more accurate information elsewhere. These criteria, however, are of little consequence to a literary analyst whose interest lies in the study of the work as a piece of verbal art. An adequate literary analysis will have to show that the

³⁹ Gor'kii, Sobranie sochinenii, pp. 399-402.

⁴⁰ Selivanovskii, V literaturnykh boiakh, pp. 300-301.

work is not merely a reflection of some political or historical events, of the conflict between the old and the new, and the depiction of Soviet youth in action, but a reorganization of all these trivial materials in a non-trivial and distinctive way through the medium of language.

CHAPTER II

TOWARDS AN INTRINSIC STUDY OF DOROGA NA OKEAN

There exist a number of interpretations of Doroga that might be considered, at least in part, attempts to leave aside, as much as possible, external considerations, and provide a more or less intrinsic analysis of the novel. Most structural references are rather superficial and fail to account for the isolated elements in any depth, which is perhaps due to the very brevity of the majority of the analyses.

Some of the observations have contributed to the understanding of the novel and of Leonov's technique, but would have proven of greater validity if they had been related to each other. The structural elements that deserve special attention in this regard are: 1) language; 2) narrative devices; 3) characterization; 4) theme; and 5) the image of Ocean.

1. Language

In numerous critical studies of Doroga reference has often been made to the difficult language used by Leonov, or to his "strong, juicy prose."¹ Other critics

¹For example, Muchnic, From Gorky, p. 295.

have pointed out the writer's skill in reproducing the weighty character of the Russian word.² Vlasov points out the intertwining of the old and the new forms of the Russian language and Leonov's ability to use exact metaphors and epithets to characterize each of his personalities in the novel.³ Others still have nothing but praise for the vivid impressions created by Leonov's style:

Particularly impressive is the vitality of the writing. The words, the images, the characters, the symbols, all are tirelessly alive. A phrase like "the boyish clouds" immediately transmits the sense of invigorating weather. A metaphor like "Snowflakes flutter and slowly choose a place to fall on" gives us the exact quality of a windless snowfall.⁴

In this connection the work of two critics, Boguslavskia and Kovalev, is of particular significance to the problem. Their endeavors in this field are far from comprehensive, but they go beyond mere subjective allusions and raise some very interesting problems that deserve further investigation. Naturally, one should not expect either of them to present an overall structural analysis of the novel. However, Kovalev, for example, selects some very specific words and phrases to illustrate the peculiarities of Leonov's language.

²Vlasov, Epos muzhestva, p. 451.

³Ibid., pp. 495, 496, 501-502, 527, 539.

⁴I. Schneider, "Road to the Ocean," New Masses, Dec. 9, 1944, p. 28.

Boguslavskaya and Kovalev distinguish two levels of language within the novel: the narrative and the scientific-publicistic levels.⁵ The narrative level of language consists of the dialogue, the meditations, and the emotional experiences of the characters. The scientific-publicistic level is tied in with the author's personality, since it includes the description of Kurilov's dreams about the future with interpolations by the narrator as well as the use of the footnote device. Scientific terminology and technological explanations are also part of the scientific-publicistic level. Boguslavskaya notes that "the first level is clear, lively, imaginative, saturated with "juicy" characteristics and a deep sense of the dramatic, at times poetic,..." The critic cites as examples of this type of language the chapters "First Snow" and Borshchnia.⁶

According to Kovalev, Leonov's language is marked by simplicity and clarity in Doroga. Leonov's metaphors are said to be clear and a means for a deeper understanding of the essence of that which is depicted. By way of illustration Kovalev quotes the following excerpt:

Gory putanogo zheleznogo loma gromozdilis' na
nasypi. Miatye vagonneye ramy, spletennye uzhasnoi

⁵ Boguslavskaya, Leonov, p. 263.

⁶ Ibid.

siloi, sluzhilo osnovaniem etogo varvarskogo altaria. Eshche dymilas' zhertva. Tushei gromadnogo zhivotnogo predstavlialas' neftianaiia tsisterna, vskinutaia na samuiu vershinu.⁷ Navsegda zapominalsia tupoi obrubok shei.

The above description concentrates not only on the external features of the crash, but also on its barbaric aspect. Passages such as the one above serve as the basis for Kovalev's claim that Leonov's narrative ability consists in more than the mere description of facts and the manipulation of the Russian language. Vlasov, in his study of the novel, confirms this statement, as he repeatedly refers to the metaphorical aspect of Leonov's language.⁸

Kovalev credits Leonov with a number of neologisms as well as a unique ability to fuse the literary language with everyday speech. Two examples of neologisms are: "Glaz starika tiazhelo nashchurilsia," and "naivnaia strel'chatost' ee resnits."⁹ It should be noted that the forms nashchurilsia and strel'chatost' are neologisms only in a very restricted sense. In nashchurilsia it is only the prefix na- (instead of so-) that is unexpected. In

⁷ Kovalev, Romany, pp. 380-381; The mountains of tangled scrap grew on the embankment. Crumpled wagon frames, intertwined by a great force, served as the foundation for this barbaric altar. The victim was still smoking. The oil tank seemed a huge animal carcass, thrown on the very top... It reminded one every bit of a blunt neck stump.

⁸ Vlasov, Epos muzhestva, pp. 364, 495-6, 502, 527, 539.

⁹ Kovalev, Romany, pp. 380-381; the old man's eye narrowed with difficulty; the naive sharpness of her eye-lashes.

strel'chatost' a particular effect is achieved by attaching a very productive suffix (-ost') to a term used almost exclusively in architecture, viz., strel'-chatyi 'lancet (as an adjective).'¹⁰ Some word combinations which are contained within the text and which reflect the fusion of literary with colloquial Russian are: "snezhnaia mokred'," "Tol'ko ne byla ne shibko khorosha soboiu," and "Kazhdoe utro menialsia peisazh za oknom; tak kapriznyi khudozhnik chernit i peremazyvaet svoe tvoren'e."¹¹ It is a pity that Kovalev does not develop his insights any further in terms of the functional importance of such linguistic features within the text.

2. Narrative Devices

In the investigation of narrative devices we will restrict our attention to: A. temporal structure; B. ruch'istost'; C. podtekst; D. types of narrative; E. development of the characters.

A. Temporal structure:

Almost every critic has, at one time or another, noted the phenomenon of chronological shifts in the

¹⁰ Private communication by G. Schaarschmidt.

¹¹ Kovalev, Romany, p. 381; the snowy moistness; only she was not very good-looking; Every day the scenery changed outside; as if a capricious artist had blackened and soiled his creation.

narrative of Leonov's Doroga. The interplay of the three temporal planes, present, past, and future, and the overall distortion of the chronological sequence of events in the novel has been referred to as a form of ostranenie (i.e., 'making strange').

Kovalev applies this term to the complexity in temporal structure of Doroga, but distinguishes sharply between the kind first formulated by the Russian formalists on the one hand, and a watered-down Soviet version on the other. What is meant by the term ostranenie is best expressed by a quotation from Erlich:

'Making it strange' did not necessarily entail substituting the elaborate for the simple; it could mean just as well the reverse--the use of the profane or earthy term instead of the learned or genteel one, provided that the latter represented in the given case the accepted usage. What mattered was not the direction of the 'semantic shift', but the very fact that such a shift occurred, ¹² that a deviation from the norm has been made.

Kovalev denounces the formalists' concept of ostranenie which he considers rooted in naturalistic and psychologistic tendencies. For him the novels of Sholokhov and Gor'kii represent a Soviet kind of ostranenie, which he interprets as consisting in complexity of structure in general, apart from the distortion of chronological events. He sees a good example of this form of ostranenie in Sholokhov's Tikhii Don, particularly with regard to its

¹²V. Erlich, Russian Formalism: History--Doctrine ('s-Gravenhage: Mouton & Co., 1955), p. 151.

complex temporal structure.¹³. In general, however, Kovalev's assertions about the existence of the two forms of ostranenie are too vague and too weakly motivated to be taken as a serious starting-point for any further investigation.

B. Ruch'istost':

In addition to ostranenie Kovalev points to the so-called principle of ruch'istost', a term that cannot be located in any Russian dictionary and is best translated by the English "stream-like character." The entire arrangement of the material in Doroga is subordinated to this principle. What it means is in essence this: some of the streams which flow to the ocean do not reach it, but seem to disappear into the sand, whereas others gradually increase in size on their way to the ocean. In the novel two such streams are represented by Pokhvisnev and Kurilov: Pokhvisnev vanishes at the end of the novel and no one remembers him; Kurilov, on the other hand, impresses the example of his life on the lives of others, such as that of Liza and Alesha.¹⁴. Kovalev's investigation of the principle of ruch'istost' is limited to these two characters, and he does not attempt to relate it to other features of the novel.

¹³ Kovalev, Romany, p. 295.

¹⁴ Kovalev, Tvorchestvo, p. 113.

C. Podtekst:

Another device that is treated extensively by Kovalev is the so-called podtekst, i.e. the 'under-current.',¹⁵

In Doroga the mechanism of this principle consists of two parts: narashchivanie situatsii, i.e., the 'grafting of the situation,' and skreshchenie koordinat, i.e., 'the intersection of coordinates.'¹⁶ As an illustration of the functioning of this mechanism and of its component parts Kovalev selects the story of the growing love between Kurilov and Liza.

After Kurilov and Liza's arrival at the rest home in Borshchnia there are some factors which further the growth of their love, and others which brake it. The introduction of the coordinate of Kurilov's "humanism" complicates and enriches the basic situation. An important factor which contributes to the discovery of their mutual affection is the rest home situation itself, since it provides them with the unusual situation of having a great deal of spare time. Another aspect of podtekst are those factors which indirectly influence the development of the situation.¹⁷

Among these are: the death of Kurilov's wife, Liza's separation from her husband, the difference in

¹⁵ Kovalev, Tvorchestvo, pp. 117-124.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 124.

¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 124-127.

age between Liza and Kurilov, and Alesha's sudden appearance during one of their most intimate encounters. Both lovers question their moral right to be happy, Kurilov because of his illness, and Liza because she has not decided yet what to do with her life. The confession of their love is a mere accident, only to be tragically interrupted by a renewed attack of Kurilov's illness. This is basically what Kovalev has in mind when he writes that Leonov "grafts" the situation by introducing various coordinates which make up podtekst.¹⁸. It can be demonstrated that the application of this device is not limited to the present narrative, but may be found in the other temporal planes as well.

D. Types of narrative:

In the discussion of narrative types four basic types of narrative may be distinguished in the novel. The complexity of the work, its multiple planes of narration and intersecting sujet lines may thus be divided into various narrative groups, each of which have a common set of characteristics. Kovalev, in an effort to define the different kinds of narrative in Doroga, explicitly specifies four of them and hints at the presence of others. The four are: 1) chronicle ("I Speak with the Historian A. M. Volchikhin");

¹⁸ Kovalev, Tvorchestvo, pp. 126-127.

2) biography ("Liza"); 3) publicism ("We Pass Through a War"); 4) scientific fantasy ("We Take Liza with Us").¹⁹ As stated by Kovalev there are other kinds of narrative which can be extracted from the novel. However, merely listing these types would satisfy only one requirement of an adequate textual analysis, that of observational adequacy. Sophisticated as this may be, it must be supplemented by an analysis of their functional relation to the fictive present in order to achieve descriptive and explanatory adequacy, the next higher goals to evaluational power.

E. Development of the characters:

Kovalev discovers a number of devices employed by Leonov for exposing the individualities of the characters in Doroga.²⁰ In Leonov's description of Kurilov's character the critic notes two courses of development: 1) the enrichment of Kurilov's ideals as depicted in the three journeys to his imaginary Ocean; and 2) the enrichment of his emotional sphere as revealed by his feelings and other qualities. Other methods which are said to be used in creating the individuality of the characters are: uncovering their ideals, characterizing their professional interests and their psychologies,

¹⁹ Kovalev, Romany, p. 379.

²⁰ Ibid., pp. 364-368.

presenting them in everyday situations and showing their relationship to others, and giving a description of their external features, including their speech peculiarities. One means of disclosing the characters' psychology is through dialogue, which gives expression to differences of opinion. In Kovalev's view, dialogue is organically connected with the content of the novel and facilitates the introduction of new situations. The detailed descriptions used by Leonov are a means of indirect characterization, as in the description of Il'ia's collector's mania, or of Kurilov's operation. In the following section a particularly interesting problem of other interpretations involving characterization will be discussed.

3. Characterization

In Concepts of Criticism Wellek states that Marxist criticism is essentially one of characters and types.²¹ This certainly appears to be the case in evaluations of Doroga. Every review of the novel mentions one or more of the characters in its analysis, but generally in reference to the criteria of socialist realism. Kovalev's and Vlasov's criticism are two exceptions to this rule, and may, therefore, be discussed together with that of three Western critics.

²¹R. Wellek, Concepts of Criticism (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1964), p. 246.

Vlasov examines each of the characterizations in the novel in great detail. His analyses of Kurilov, Liza, Gleb, Il'ia, and Pokhvisnev essentially agree with those of Kovalev. One trait of Kurilov's characters is studied in more detail than by other critics. This is Kurilov's fear of dying and his wish for immortality, which Vlasov considers a positive quality of Kurilov's character rather than a negative one.²² Vlasov also examines Leonov's depiction of youth more extensively; Alesha, Saifulla, and Marina are studied closely in their relation to the novel.

Vlasov disagrees with Kovalev that Saifulla is not well depicted in the novel, but considers the young Tatar one of Leonov's best portraits.²³ This type of person is depicted in accordance with the best traditions of past literature. Alesha Peresypkin is essential to the content of the novel, as he reveals the past of the railroad and is the instrument which, as well as the first-person narrator, carries Kurilov's dream of Ocean to the future.²⁴ Vlasov distinguishes the characters according to their philosophy of life, but does not categorize them as Kovalev does.

²² Vlasov, Epos muzhestva, pp. 370-371, 545-548.

²³ Ibid., pp. 535, 540.

²⁴ Ibid., pp. 528-530.

According to Kovalev, three main types of characters are represented in Doroga. They are differentiated according to ideological principles with the resulting divisions: 1) characters with high Soviet ideals; 2) persons who are being re-educated in the spirit of socialism; 3) the defenders of the bourgeois world and bearers of that ideology.²⁵. The third group includes people whose morals are alien to those of socialism. They are subclassed into two categories: 1) a "wolf" type like Gleb, who is embittered against the new regime, yet outwardly supports it, but also fears his exposure; and 2) the type who, among the defenders of the bourgeois world, appears as a pillar of society.²⁶.

In a very brief character analysis both Simmons and van der Eng-Liedmeier claim that Kurilov represents a new prototype of communist lover.²⁷. Simmons points out that Kurilov spends actually more time in reveries about, and the pursuit of, love, than did the heroes in Leonov's previous novels.²⁸. Simmons interprets Kurilov's words that Catherine had never been enough for him as the key to his behavior, which leads him from a feeling of platonic friendship towards Marina to the confession of

²⁵ Kovalev, Romany, pp. 295-296.

²⁶ Kovalev, Tvorchestvo, pp. 94-95.

²⁷ Simmons, Russian Fiction, p. 127; A. M. van der Eng-Liedmeier, Soviet Literary Characters: An Investigation into the Portrayal of Soviet Men in Russian Prose, 1917-1953 ('s-Gravenhage: Mouton & Co., 1959), p. 111

²⁸ Simmons, Russian Fiction, pp. 127, 128.

his love for Liza. Van der Eng-Liedmeier, however, argues that it is Kurilov's illness which acts as the driving force in his search for love, since it is only then that he realizes more fully what he lacks. The feeling of his unfulfilled love arouses his interest in the loves of others.²⁹. A type of a somewhat different sort is represented by Klavdiia, the unhappy elderly person who constantly forces herself to suppress all emotions. Van der Eng-Liedmeier considers Klavdiia Kurilov's counterpart in Doroga. He contrasts the two characters by pointing out the aridity of Klavdiia's love life and her unhappiness after her fiancé's tragic death. Since that time she has suppressed her feelings of friendship and love, devoting her time entirely to Party affairs.³⁰. Van der Eng-Liedmeier attributes Kurilov's involvement with people to his "humaneness."³¹.

Struve concurs with van der Eng-Liedmeier that an essential attribute of Kurilov's character is "humaneness."³². Both base this observation upon Kurilov's relationships with people, especially with two former members of the

²⁹ Eng-Liedmeier, Soviet Literary Characters, p. 111.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 113.

³¹ Ibid., p. 112.

³² G. Struve, Soviet Russian Literature, 1917-50 (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1951), p. 272.

bourgeoisie, his brother-in-law Omelichev and Gleb Protoklitov.³³ To illustrate this trait on the basis of Kurilov's relationship with Gleb seems incorrect in view of the fact that Kurilov actually does search into Gleb's past and wants to expose this man for what he is, or rather, was. Although Kurilov does not immediately dismiss Gleb from his post at the Cheremshansk yard, he asks his secretary to make an inquiry about him. This may be ascribed to the quality of caution in Kurilov, rather than "humaneness." A clearer reflection of the character trait "humaneness" is the teacher image which Kurilov presents in his relations with young people such as Alesha, Marina, her son Ziamka, and Liza.

A specific peculiarity which, to van der Eng-Liedmeier, appears as a negative quality in the character of the "hero," is Kurilov's fear of death, manifested in his constant postponing of the operation which may cure his illness.³⁴ His hesitation to undergo the operation stems from his feeling of the uselessness of death:

...he regretted that he could not end his life in a more intelligent way..., that he could protect his great leader with his body or fall before a firing squad, so that one might learn from his example.³⁵

³³ Struve, Soviet Russian Literature, p. 272; Eng-Liedmeier, Soviet Literary Characters, p. 112.

³⁴ Eng-Liedmeier, Soviet Literary Characters, p. 111.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 112.

Simmons emphasizes that Kurilov is not the embodiment of the perfect man, but that Leonov credits him with some imperfections.³⁶ The author is said to be eager to minimize Kurilov's greatness; he asserts unceasingly that Kurilov is a simple man. Kurilov is depicted as a man who enjoys various pleasures of life, such as smoking a pipe, the beauties of nature, and occasionally going out to the theatre. Furthermore, his shortcomings are directly stated in the text: "Hastiness and oversimplification characterized his deductions."³⁷ The relationships between Kurilov and the other main characters are not studied in depth by any of the critics, thus leaving a wide scope for investigation.

Kovalev concentrates his attention on the study of the two main contrasting characters in Doroga, i.e. Kurilov and Pokhvisnev. Pokhvisnev tries to live in the irrevocable past and looks forward only to see the ultimate destruction of the entire world. This is illustrated by his dream about the moon colliding with the earth. Kurilov is the exact opposite: he is striving to improve life in the present and believes in a better world in the future.³⁸

³⁶ Simmons, Russian Fiction, p. 127.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Kovalev, Tvorchestvo, pp. 90-91.

4. Theme

Apart from the central theme of the novel, i.e. the outlook into the future, Kovalev discovers various other motifs. According to his analysis, the following themes are distinguishable: A. the family; B. love; C. agony and tragedy; D. the past.

A. The family:

Kovalev states that the concept of the "new" family plays an important role in Doroga. He sees this importance in the depiction of the decline of the old bourgeois family and the formation of the new socialist family. The love between Kurilov and Liza shows the disintegration of the bourgeois type of family. The cause of the dissolution of the Protoklitovs' marriage are their conflicting opinions about the essence of marriage. Liza uses the name Protoklitov as a means to maintain her position in the acting troupe, although Il'ia seems to have no influence in the theatre. Il'ia clings to the old-fashioned notion of marriage and considers Liza mainly as a future mother. He does not understand her passion for the theatre and her aspirations to personal success. The combination of these factors leads to the ultimate dissolution of their marriage.³⁹.

Other characters in the novel which reflect the decay of the traditional family are: Marina, Kormilitsyn,

³⁹ Kovalev, Romany, pp. 328-332.

Gleb, and Omelichev.⁴⁰ Another example of a break with traditional family relations is Saifulla's story. This young Tatar severs his ties with ancient traditions and creates new ones in his present working milieu.

B. Love:

Kovalev's discussion of the love theme consists mainly in a summary of the action in the development of Kurilov's and Liza's love.⁴¹ Love plays an important role in Kurilov's life; nonetheless his hopes of attaining fulfilment are frustrated by his illness. Kovalev regrets that Leonov gave this episode such a tragic ending.⁴² Similarly, he reproaches Leonov for not having shown more of Katia's life. The love between Saifulla and Katia, which grows out of their congenial attitude to work and life in general is never fully motivated in the novel.⁴³

C. Agony and tragedy:

There appear to be two conflicting views on the theme of tragedy in the novel. While Serebrianskii considers Kurilov's life tragic and deprived of happiness,⁴⁴

⁴⁰ Kovalev, Romany, pp. 328-332.

⁴¹ Ibid., pp. 332-334.

⁴² Ibid., p. 333.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 338.

⁴⁴ Serebrianskii, "Doroga," p. 3.

Kovalev insists that Kurilov would have been unhappy if he had been forced to live in another way.⁴⁵ Kovalev would thus claim that tragedy is not a major theme in the novel.

In his discussion of the agony theme Kovalev examines the lives of three of the characters, Kormilitsyn, Pakhomov, and Pokhvisnev.⁴⁶ Kormilitsyn suffers because of his wife's unfaithfulness and wants everyone else to suffer with him. He torments Gleb with descriptions of his wife's behavior and repeatedly refers to her affair with the "other man." Pakhomov, a failure in the acting profession and in life, feels that to be a great actor one must suffer. Finally, Pokhvisnev symbolizes the agony theme, since he has never been able to succeed in his work or in love, and lives solely in a dream-world of the past.⁴⁷

D. The past:

Simmons, analyzing the depiction of the past in Doroga, concludes that the function of the often "tangentially related" characters and situations is to enrich the depiction of the present.⁴⁸ Leonov

⁴⁵ Kovalev, Romany, p. 319.

⁴⁶ Ibid., pp. 352-357.

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 352.

⁴⁸ Simmons, Russian Fiction, p. 130.

accomplishes this by looking at the past from the viewpoint of the present. This results in a past that appears despotic and loathsome, and in which only the spirit of revolt among the peasants relieves the gloom. Moreover, the function of Leonov's excursions into the past is:

to shed light on the early career of Kurilov, his relations with the Protoklitov family, the highborn father of which had sentenced him to Siberia and had obscenely suggested to Catherine, when she asked permission to visit him in prison that he take her husband's place, an action which years later served to motivate Kurilov's determined tracking down of the son, Gleb Protoklitov. On the whole, it is an unlovely picture of the past but one carefully selected to illuminate and explain the present and ⁴⁹justify Leonov's excursions into the future.

Thus the past, which is so frequently criticized as being irrelevant in the novel, can be seen to provide information which facilitates the understanding of the fictive present. The other temporal plane which seemingly is of little relevance with respect to the present is the visionary future, which takes the form of the image of Ocean.

5. Image of Ocean

The title of the novel indicates that Ocean is the focal point of the novel. Nevertheless, the study of the phenomenon of this visionary future has been grossly neglected by the majority of critics. Some have mentioned that Ocean is the utopia of the communist future, but otherwise dismiss its significance in the

⁴⁹Simmons, Russian Fiction, p. 130.

novel. Most of them agree that the image of Ocean, as depicted in Doroga, is not particularly convincing.

Simmons, for example, states: "Taken by themselves these three journeys into the future do not possess much merit as literary exercises or flights of the imagination."⁵⁰

A most trivial criterion applied in the examination of the three futuric chapters has been the question of their actual reflection of reality. While some critics have pointed to their "unreal" or unconvincing nature, others have praised their author for his astounding prophetic gift. The prophetic nature of the Oceanic chapters, such as the establishment of the Chinese Republic, the prediction of World War II, and of great technological advances, such as the flight of man into space, is indeed quite significant. However, so far these chapters have been studied exclusively in terms of external evidence. An American reviewer asserts, e.g., that the novel is symbolic for Russia's plans for world domination:

..., then his message must necessarily carry some weight. That being so, the world's statesmen of today and tomorrow should be advised that Russia is, after all, dreaming of world domination. At least, that would seem to be the purport of this book.⁵¹

This interpretation may very well account for the explicit aims of a certain type of ideology as expressed by one of

⁵⁰ Simmons, Russian Fiction, p. 136.

⁵¹ (G. H. L.), "Are These Russia's Dreams?", Hartford Courant Magazine, Dec. 10, 1944, p. 12.

its followers. On the other hand, a generalization of this sort must fail to account for the fact that the "statements in a novel... are not literally true; they are not logical propositions."⁵² In other words, the interpretation given above implies that Leonov's novel is not verbal art. Since this is the case there is no need to argue this point any further in our framework of reference.

Simmons considers the journeys into the visionary future as an integral part of Doroga. They are not merely extensions of time and space but also of ideas. They are, moreover, interrelated with respect to action, symbolism, and characterization. For further discussion of this point, see Chapter IV. Motivation for the imaginary journeys is provided by Kurilov's incessant visions of the future of Communist society: "A man of his time, Kurilov always tried to visualize the distant goal towards which his Party was moving."⁵³

A book which Kurilov read as a child suggests the form and symbolic character of Ocean. Simmons distinguishes two forms of Ocean: in one case it symbolizes the capital of the socialist world, in the other the capital of the whole world after the final victory of Communism. A fundamental symbol of Ocean is that of

⁵² Wellek and Warren, Theory of Literature, p. 25.

⁵³ Simmons, Russian Fiction, p. 134.

a "vast free flux into which all past, present, and future streams of socialist thought and action flow."⁵⁴.

Having closely examined the three chapters, the critic then sums up his findings as follows:

But the final picture of the world Communist Utopia is blurred and unconvincing and must have offered little comfort, even as a propaganda gesture, to Soviet readers. They would most want to know how this future paradise of Communist abundance was organized, but to this the author lamely answers: "I am glad that my ignorance of technology exempts me from the necessity of citing facts and figures."⁵⁵.

Simmons' commentary on Ocean raises several interesting questions, in particular with regard to the interrelation of the chapters on Ocean with the rest of the novel in terms of the action and of characterization. These questions, which are not further investigated by Simmons, will form part of our discussion in Chapter IV.

Kovalev considers the chapters about the future as very necessary in the novel, since it is their function to emphasize the greatness of the present. He argues that the future is presented not as a static element, but as a living, regular continuation of the present. The chapter "We Take Liza with Us" serves as substantiation of his argument.⁵⁶. It is considered as having a complex artistic function in that "it completes Kurilov's spiritual

⁵⁴ Simmons, Russian Fiction, p. 135.

⁵⁵ Ibid., pp. 135-136.

⁵⁶ Kovalev, Tvorchestvo, p. 114.

being, disclosing more fully his humanistic ideals, as well as completing the cycle of chapters about the future day of humanity."⁵⁷. In addition the chapter is designed to show the direction of Liza's spiritual growth, as expressed in the following excerpt:

Ona zhadno vpityvala vse, chto okruzhalo nas, i etot blagorodnyi vozdukh druzhby, i eto prekrasnoe volnenie, proiskhodiashchee ot sozertsaniia geroicheskikh del; takaia detskaia vostorzhennost' byla v ee glazakh, chto mne proshlos' navsegda izmenit' svoe pervonachal'noe mnenie o nei.⁵⁸

Contrary to the opinion of some critics who regard Liza's transformation as a rather unreal process, Simmons states that the change is not "inconsistent with the logic of her developing personality."⁵⁹. Neither Kovalev nor Simmons study Liza's conversion in detail, although both treat her characterization to some extent.

The acceptance or negation of the visionary future by other characters in the novel is mentioned in passing by Kovalev. Dudnikov, Gleb, and Pokhvisnev deny its existence; Il'ia, Saifulla, and Liza are searching for it; and Kurilov, Alesha, and Marina already have knowledge of it. The "road to the Ocean" becomes a way of life for the heroes and defines their strength in life.⁶⁰.

⁵⁷ Kovalev, Romany, p. 308.

⁵⁸ Ibid.; She greedily absorbed all that surrounded us, both this noble atmosphere of friendship, and this beautiful emotion, emanating from the contemplation of heroic accomplishments; such a childlike enthusiasm was in her eyes, that I forever changed my original opinion of her.

⁵⁹ Simmons, Russian Fiction, p. 137.

⁶⁰ Kovalev, Romany, p. 296.

Conclusion

The lack of a comprehensive investigation of the structure of Leonov's Doroga na okean severely limits the conclusiveness of any of the observations made by the critics. Taken as individual units, the structural features of the novel only provide evidence of the existence of various structural devices employed by Leonov in Doroga. However, this is far from sufficient in pointing out their integral nature within the framework of the novel. It is hoped that a more extensive analysis of the narrative devices employed will adequately prove the inclusive nature of the past and of the chapters on Ocean as well as their overall function in the novel.

CHAPTER III

THE RAISON D'ETRE OF THE PAST

In the previous two chapters various kinds of critical statements and the main criteria used by critics in their interpretations of Doroga were examined. It was found that the basic procedure consisted in imposing externally determined frameworks upon the interpretations of isolated elements in the text. The present analysis proceeds from the assumption that a genuine literary analysis should be based on the "materials" and the structure of the work.¹

The two aspects of the novel to be discussed are the inclusive nature of the past and of the visionary future in Doroga na okean and their relation to the text as a whole. This will be done in the attempt to examine Struve's statement:

But this story of the past, told with many unsavory details, in that Dostoyevskian vein of which Leonov is so fond, seems a rather artificial adjunct to the main story, and its ² raison d'être is not very easy to detect.

and a further claim that "even more important was Leonov's

¹ See Wellek and Warren, Theory of Literature, p. 141.

² Struve, Soviet Russian Literature 1917-50, p. 273.

failure to blend organically his Utopia with the rest of the novel."³.

In the preceding research it was shown that Leonov was frequently criticized for the excessive emphasis on the past and for the "unconvincing" nature of the imaginary future. Chapters III and IV of this thesis will further test Simmons' claim that the chapters dealing with Ocean are an "integral part of the total design of the novel: they are extensions not only of time and space but also of idea."⁴.

The past in Doroga is usually presented in the form of flashbacks to an earlier incident, or series of incidents, relevant to the particular situation in which a character finds himself. For example, the chapter entitled "Brat'ia Protoklitovy" reveals the incidents leading up to Gleb Protoklitov's present position on the railroad and his reason for deceiving Kurilov. Similarly, Il'ia's past experiences are introduced to clarify his present situation.

Most of the chapters dealing with the past are directly or indirectly introduced via episodes connected with Kurilov. Thus, Protoklitov is drawn into the story just prior to the scene of the train wreck (at the meeting of Kurilov's committee members), merely by the mentioning

³Struve, Soviet Russian Literature 1917-50, p. 273.

⁴Simmons, Russian Fiction, p. 134.

of his name in answer to one of Kurilov's questions. Omelichev and Pokhvisnev are introduced in a similar manner at the site of the train wreck in the chapters "Chelovek na mostu" and "V poved' vtiagivaetsia Arkadii Germogenovich," respectively. The manner in which these seemingly unrelated elements are brought into the stream of the story and their function in complementing events that take place in the fictive present, constitute the next topic of discussion. The narrative devices will be investigated in conjunction with the role of the narrator, the devices used to introduce the characters, and the significance of the flashbacks.

1. The Narrator

The question of the role of the narrator in the novel is of prime importance to the present discussion. The manner of drawing characters into the stream of the story and the use of flashbacks are excellent illustrations of the use of the viewpoint technique in Doroga.

One of the most salient features of a literary work of art, such as the novel, is the telling of the story by a narrator. The position which the narrator may adopt, his point of view or angle of narration, is defined as "the restriction of the reader's observation

to a limited field of consciousness."⁵. Three major categories may be distinguished within the technique of "point of view": 1) first-person narration (Ich-Erzählung), in which the narrator tells of events as he experienced or heard of them;⁶ 2) multiple point of view, i.e. a number of characters in the novel may present their different impressions of an event; and 3) the omniscient third-person narrator.⁷. The last category implies a flexibility on the part of the narrator, who is able to control the flow of the story by revealing or concealing facts in order to attain certain ends.

Leonov employs elements of all three types of narration in Doroga na okean. In the sequence of the first six chapters, for instance, the viewpoint shifts between two forms of narration--the composite point of view of the characters and the omniscient narrator. The chapter "Kurilov razgovarivaet" illustrates use of both of these forms of narration. The chapter beginning points to the omniscient narrator:

⁵R. Eastman, A Guide to the Novel (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1965), p. 31.

⁶See C. H. Grabo, The Technique of the Novel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928), p. 39; B. Romberg, Studies in the Narrative Technique of the First-Person Novel (Stockholm: Håkan Ohlssons Boktryckeri, 1962), pp. 33-57.

⁷Grabo, Technique, p. 33.

Beseda s drugom ne vozvrashchaet molodosti...
 Drug rasskazyval to, chto pomnil sam Kurilov.
 On i ne ⁸umel bol'she; eto byl staryi, byvalyi
 wagon,...

The narrator then reveals that Kurilov also took part in a war: "No chlen armeiskogo revvoensoveta nazyvalsia teper' nachal'nikom politotdela doroga."⁹ No further indication of Kurilov's past is supplied at this point by the narrator; these are revealed at later stages throughout the novel.

When the railroad officials enter the room in which Kurilov is sitting, an external description of the railroad head is presented from their point of view:

Srazu pri pomnilos', chto v Revizani etot chelovek s plechami gruzchika i lbom Sokrata odnogo otdal pod sud, a troikh ¹⁰sobstvennoi vlast'iu posadil na raznye sroki.

Similarly, Kurilov's reaction to the name Protoklitov is described from their viewpoint: "Zametno udivlennyi, Kurilov razdumchivo vertel karandash. Dolzhno byt' on

⁸Talking with a friend does not bring back one's youth. The friend had told Kurilov all that he himself remembered. It could do no more; it was an old 'experienced' wagon,.... (p. 7). Page reference to Doroga in this section will be indicated in round brackets at the end of translations or paraphrases in footnotes. The translations given in the footnotes are those of the writer of this thesis.

⁹But the member of the revolutionary army council was now called head of the political department of the railroad (p. 7).

¹⁰They immediately recalled, that in Revizan this man with the shoulders of a stevedore and the forehead of a Socrates had brought one person to trial, and had sentenced three others on his own authority to various jail terms (p. 9).

ponadeialsia na pamiat', raz ne zapisal familii smel'chaka."¹¹ After the telephone call informing Kurilov of the train crash the viewpoint shifts back to the omniscient narrator.

Evidence of the omniscience of the narrator is clearly indicated in the chapter "Chelovek na mostu" by his statement: "Nuzhno bylo znat' mnogoe izikh prezhnikh otnoshenii, chtob ne divit'sia sumasshedshei proniknovennosti besedy."¹² Evidently, the narrator knows more of the previous relationship between the two men, but he is not prepared to reveal it at this time.

In the majority of the other chapters dealing with the present and the past the narrator shifts between these two angles of narration. However, there are three chapters, apart from those of the visionary future, which employ first-person narrations. These chapters are: "Ia razgovarivaiu s istorikom A. M. Volchikhinym," "Stol," and "Posleslovie."

The first instance of first-person narration occurs at the very beginning of the novel, when the narrator refers to Kurilov as "moi geroi" (my hero) (p. 7) and discloses a personal interest in the novel. He does

¹¹Visibly surprised and deeply in thought, Kurilov toyed with his pencil. Apparently he relied on his memory, since he did not immediately write down the name of this dare-devil (p. 9).

¹²It was necessary to know much of their previous relations, in order not to be surprised at the mad emotionality of the talk (p. 24).

not re-appear as a participant in the story, in either the present or the past, before the chapter "Ia razgovarivaiu s istorikom A. M. Volchikhinym." Although the narrator, actually Peresypkin, is supposedly in Porozhensk to find out more about Liza's childhood, he introduces the history of the Omelichev family, and in the chapter "Kurilov beret v dolg u Omelicheva" he discloses the nature of the debt Kurilov owes to Omelichev.

The chapter "Stol" reveals that the narrator, Kurilov's friend in the Oceanic chapters, also knows Klavdiia: "V etot den' Klavdiia Nikitichna prosila menia poekhat' s neiu v bol'nitsu;... My priekhali vovremia."¹³ Lastly, in the epilogue the narrator perpetuates Kurilov's dream as he and Alesha go on further travels to Ocean. In these chapters the narrator discloses his friendship with Kurilov. Thus, his activities in the present offer a direct link with the "I" of the visionary future.¹⁴ In the fictive present the first-person narrator describes the operation which leads to Kurilov's death; in the Oceanic chapters he reveals Kurilov's dream for a better life to come and the search for a means to overcome death. The first-person narrator is a connecting link between all three levels, though more so in relation to the present and the visionary future than the past.

¹³ That day Klavdiia Nikitichna asked me to accompany her to the hospital;... We arrived in time (p. 537).

¹⁴ See below, p. 71.

Assuming omniscience in the past, the narrator adjusts the introduction of relevant incidents to suitable events in the present. This, in effect, constitutes a time-shift without any sharp break in time. Mendilov, in a study of time in the novel, states:

In effect it [the time-shift, M.L.] makes a virtue of necessity by the fragmentation of the sequence; all sense of continuity is lost, and the gaps between the incidents treated remain therefore unnoticed.¹⁵

First indications of the time-shift are reflected in the chapter headings. The sense of continuity is created through character development and the use of illustrative thematic parallels or contrasts, as in the flashbacks to the past. These occur between the various phases of Kurilov's career and of his personal life, throwing light on the different stages of his emotional development or on the problems of the railroad.

The chapter headings indicate the progression of the action in the present. The first seven chapters are concerned with Kurilov at home and at work; most of the characters who will have influence on him at later stages of the novel are introduced at this point. Chapters which reveal situations that are parallel to or in contrast with, those of Kurilov's own are entitled by the names of the characters involved, such as "Brat'ia Protoklitovy," "Liza," or else by a general term, as

¹⁵ A. A. Mendilov, Time and the Novel (London; New York: Peter Nevill Ltd., 1952), p. 75.

for example, "Prikliuchenie" or "Aktrisa." They indicate a close relationship to Kurilov's personal life. The other chapters which study the past are either couched in more general terms, or are overtly concerned with the past. The chapter "Marina sostavliaet zhizneopisanie Kurilova" describes Kurilov's imprisonment during tsarist times and his role in the revolutionary war; the chapters "Kurilov razgovarivaet," "Istoricheskie opyty Aleshi Peresypkina," and "Spir'ka prokhodit po Aleshinym stranitsam" also demonstrate preoccupation with the past. The gradual worsening of Kurilov's illness is reflected in the chapter titles: "Pripadok," "Telo," "Kurilov izobreetaet kurs lecheniia," and "Soldat stuchit veslom v kurilovskuiu dver'."

The first chapter headings reflect Kurilov's role in Doroga, from "Kurilov razgovarivaet" to "Kurilov i ego sputniki v zhizni" and his dream of Ocean. The last chapters indicate that the central point of interest has changed to Liza. The chapters "Akterskoe pal'to," "Paiats," and "Zanaves opuskaetsia" reflect the absence of Kurilov's person in the final sections of the novel. Thus, chapter headings indicate the change in the focal point of interest and the resultant shift in time.

2. Unobtrusive Introduction of Characters

In the first seven chapters Leonov prepares the development of further action in the novel by

introducing most of the major characters. Although the relationships among the characters are not perceptible at first, they are gradually revealed as the action in Doroga progresses. Two of the means by which the characters are brought into the framework of the novel are: a) through the association of objects and people, and b) through the element of chance.

A. The association of objects and people:

The first person to be drawn into the story by means of this device is Kurilov's sister Klavdiia. During the first meeting of Kurilov and the railroad officials, those present immediately associate Kurilov with Klavdiia, a stern, dogmatic Party member: "... , chto sestre ego, pochti legendarnoi Klavdii Kurilcvoi, poruchena chistkaikh dorogi."¹⁶.

Protoklitov, head of the Cheremshansk yard, is introduced under similar circumstances. During the meeting mentioned above Kurilov asks for the name of the missing committee member. When he receives the reply "Protoklitov" his reaction is one of surprise. His attitude hints at some previous relationship between the two men. Later, at the scene of the train wreck this impression is reinforced, when Kurilov asks various officials: "'Vasha familiia ne Protoklitov, '--sprosil

¹⁶..., that his sister, the almost legendary Klavdiia Kurilova, was in charge of the purge of their railroad (p. 9).

na vsiakii sluchai nachpdor. 'Nikak net, Kusin!'"¹⁷.

A few days later in his office Kurilov makes Gleb Protoklitov's acquaintance. Gleb mentions during the course of the conversation that a surgeon of the same name lives in Moscow. After Gleb's departure, Kurilov's curiosity prompts him to make a telephone call to the doctor:

Trebovalos' tol'ko uznat', net li u professora brata-transportnika. Lzhivost' odnogo etogo punkta oznachala by poroghnost' vsei protoklitovskoi biografii...¹⁸.

In this way, Il'ia in his turn is drawn into the stream of the story.

Immediately after his encounter with Kurilov, Gleb goes to visit the surgeon, who is in reality his brother. Upon entering Il'ia's apartment Gleb notices fragments of a broken object on the floor and asks Il'ia: "'Kto eto nadelal? Sobaka?'" upon which he receives Il'ia's answer: "'Net, zhena.'"¹⁹. Il'ia's reply constitutes the first reference to Liza.

Kurilov's wife, Katerinka, enters the story in a flashback to his visits to the hospital:

¹⁷ Is your name not Protoklitov?--the chief asked just to make sure. By no means, my name is Kusin! (p. 15).

¹⁸ He only needed to know whether the professor had a brother who was a transport worker. The falsity of this one point would point to the fallaciousness of the whole Protoklitov biography... (p. 58).

¹⁹ Who did this? Your dog?; No, my wife (p. 65).

Odnako v poslednie mesiatsy emu dovelos' nabliudat' umiranie sovsem vblizi, ... Na etot raz opyt byl obstavljen s laboratornoi tshchatel'nost'iu, ...

As will be demonstrated later in this thesis this flashback is also essential for the understanding of Kurilov's search for love.

Thus, each of these characters enters the story through the use of associations with other characters in the novel.

B. Chance:

Leonov also exploits the element of chance in his introduction of some of his characters. Chance appears to be limited to those apparently "accidental" but fortuitous encounters between Kurilov and some of the other characters in the work. The term "chance," as it is considered by some critics in the meaning of

²⁰ However, during the last months he had the opportunity to observe death quite closely, . . . This time the experiment was prepared with laboratorial thoroughness

Twice in ten days, at the beginning even more often, Kurilov visited this place. On the one nearest the window lay a sharp-nosed woman, not pampered by fate or a husband. She was disconcerted in front of the nurse by Kurilov's visits; ... (p. 30).

"if," i.e. speculations such as: if Liza had not had an abortion her marriage may have been saved,²¹ is extraneous to this study.

The series of coincidences referred to are the encounters between Kurilov and Omelichev, Pokhvisnev, and Liza. Kurilov meets Omelichev solely by chance. After the derailment in the chapter "Krushenie," Kurilov walks away from the crash site to ponder in silence, and finds himself on a bridge. Another man is standing on that bridge, and Kurilov addresses him. Laconically the narrator states: "Oni uznali drug druga s pervogo vzgliada. Vstrecha byla neozhidannaia dlia oboikh."²² Though the man gives the name of Khozhatkin, Kurilov knows his true identity, just as Khozhatkin recognizes the head of the railroad. This man, who appears to be a simple peasant, is actually Omelichev and we are made aware of Kurilov's indebtedness to him:

Nastroiashchei familii etogo cheloveka, kogda-to znamenitoi na Kame, nel'zia bylo zabyt'...
Pomnilos' takzhe, chto Pavel Stepanovich
Omelichev ne imel zhivykh brat'ev;...²³

²¹ See, e.g., Kovalev, Romany, p. 299. Kovalev is also careful to distinguish between the Soviet use of this device and the formalistic one. The Soviet one, as illustrated by Leonov in Doroga is based on the class struggle and is socially, ideologically, and psychologically motivated (p. 298).

²² They recognized each other at first glance. The meeting was unexpected for both of them (p. 19).

²³ The real name of this man, which at one time was well-known on the Kama, was impossible to forget... He also recalled that Pavel Stepanovich Omelichev had no living brothers (p. 20).

It appears from this passage that Omelichev rendered Kurilov a service at some time prior to this encounter, but no further details of the nature of the debt are given. The two men talk for a short while, in the course of which the name Frosia is mentioned by Kurilov:

"'Frosia-to zhiva?'--neozhidanno dla sebia sprosil Kurilov. ... 'A ne znaiu. Sem' let--sroku mnogo.'"²⁴

The name Frosia is only mentioned in passing, and the relationship to either of the two men is not clarified. As the narrator states, one had to know a lot about their past relationship to understand the strange nature of their talk.²⁵

Kurilov returns to the site of the wreck after his conversation with Omelichev. He is approached by an old man, whose name is Pokhvisnev, and who insists on continuing his journey. Kurilov invites him to spend the night in his private railroad car and in the morning offers to take Pokhvisnev with him to Moscow, an offer which the old man turns down. He departs, inadvertently leaving his bundle behind, a fact which Kurilov notices but of which he is not consciously aware:

Kurilov brosilsia k zadnemu oknu i podnial shtorku... Putaias' v polakh svoego brezenta, starik ukhodil po shpalam... Uzelka pri nem ne bylo.

²⁴ Is Frosia still alive?--Kurilov asked unexpectedly even for himself. --I don't know. Seven years is a long time (p. 21).

²⁵ See also footnote 12 of this chapter.

--Vot gusak,--usmekhnul'sia sam sebe
Kurilov. --Zanozisty²⁶i kakoi...

The incident of the bundle leads to another fortuitous meeting. In attempting to return the bundle Kurilov meets Pokhvisnev's niece, Liza, with whom he later falls in love (p. 152).

In the early stages of Doroga Leonov reveals very little about the characters and the relationships among them. They are simply flashed across the screen and then withdrawn. But it is impossible in this way to relate them and reveal their character in more depth. This is effected to some extent by means of the flashback technique.

C. Flashback:

Flashbacks are used by the narrator to effect a transition in time from the present to the past and at the same time to reveal further character traits. These glimpses into the past are introduced at various stages of the action in the novel, uncovering what was merely hinted at previously.

The flashback concerning Kurilov's relationship with his wife in the chapter "Kurilov i ego sputniki v zhizni" disclosed the loneliness of his former

²⁶Kurilov approached the back window and raised the blind... Wrapped in his slicker, the old man walked along the poles in the fields... His bundle was not with him. --What a strange character--Kurilov chuckled to himself. --What a quarrelsome one... (p. 29).

love life and explains his constant search for love throughout the novel. A couple in front of his window is symbolic of the happiness which he has never experienced himself: "Povest' byla v samom nachale, oni eshche ne smeli obnimat'sia."²⁷ When Kurilov himself falls in love, the image recurs, but now with the lovers embracing one another. After seeing them the first time Kurilov begins to realize that "s Katerinkoi u nego vsegda byli otosheniiia tol'ko chestnoi i trezvoi druzhby."²⁸ His pursuit of love and his tendency to day-dream reflect his romantic nature.

The cause of Kurilov's illness is indicated in the chapter "Marina sostavliaet zhizneopisanie Kurilova." Marina asks Kurilov about his life and he tells her of his imprisonment, suggesting that his illness may have stemmed from the beatings he received (p. 140). The disclosure of this element of Kurilov's past comes shortly after his first serious attack and the journey to the visionary future, and explains the relation of his illness to the present.

The flashback to the Omelichev dynasty in the chapter "Ia razgovarivaiu s istorikom A. M. Volchikhinym"

²⁷ The story was at the very beginning, they had not yet dared embrace one another (p. 32).

²⁸ He had always had an honorable and sober relationship of friendship with Katerinka (p. 33).

completes the depiction of Omelichev in the present.

It explains Omelichev's embittered attitude towards the new regime and his failure to adjust to the new way of life. The financial success attained by past generations of the Omelichev family, stands in direct contrast to the position of the only surviving member of the family, Pavel Stepanovich. Omelichev no longer retains a position of power but has become a peasant. His sickly son, Luka, also reflects Omelichev's inability to adjust to life under the socialist regime and to the new family relationships in it.

Kurilov's debt to Omelichev becomes apparent in the chapter "Kurilov beret dolg u Omelicheva." The episode reveals the reason for Kurilov's tolerance towards his brother-in-law, since it was Omelichev who hid him from the Whites during the Civil War.

The flashbacks relating to Il'ia's hobbies ("Prikliuchenie") and Efim Arsent'ich ("On edet na Okean"), one of Kurilov's former teachers, present a somewhat more difficult case in interpretation. They appear to have one common feature, viz., that both Dudnikov, Il'ia's former schoolmaster, and Efim Arsent'ich have passed the peak of their glory and usefulness and bask in the glory of their accomplishments. Neither one of them is of further use in the society in which they live. Dudnikov seems to represent the decline of a irrevocable era, to which he still clings tenaciously.

"Ia razdumal prodavat' moego Karona. Ne khochu; poniatno? Ia otdam ego moemu grekosu..."²⁹. The man who lives with Dudnikov argues with him and tells him to give it to the doctor. When he does not want to they come to blows, and the smaller man seizes the clock after Dudnikov's death. Il'ia discovers later that his name is Pokhvisnev.

At this point there is no indication that Kurilov is ill or that he will not be able to carry out his work. The first sign of his declining powers appears after the narrative shifts back to the present and Kurilov suffers his first serious attack (p. 120). Kurilov's unsuccessful attempt to reform a young thief, Gavrila, who is caught in the act of stealing and who becomes his friend, yields further evidence of his decline.

On pozval po imeni svoego malen'kogo plennika (emu ne prishlo v golovu, chto mal'chika Gavrilu, esli by on byl zdes', dolzhna byla razbudit' ego sumatokha). Nichto ne otkliknulos' emu... Perevernutyi chemodan valialsia v uglu... S tosklivym chuvstvom Aleksei Nikitich poiskal glazami trubku; ona vsegda lezhala gde-nibud' na vidu, no znachit, khoziaistvennomu Gavrile ponadobilas' i trubka.³⁰

²⁹ I have changed my mind about selling my Caron. I don't want to; understand? I will give it to my "Grekos" (p. 79).

³⁰ He called the name of his small captive (it did not enter his mind, that the boy, Gavrila, if he had been there, would have been awakened by the turmoil). Nothing responded... His overturned suitcase was lying in the corner;... With a dull feeling Aleskei Nikitich searched for his pipe; it always used to be somewhere in sight, but it seemed that the thrifty Gavrila had needed his pipe as well (p. 432).

Pokhvisnev's biography, as reflected in the chapters "Arkadii Germogenovich i ego nachinka" and "Tot zhe A. G. Pokhvisnev v natural'nuiu velichinu," furnishes a distinct contrast in beliefs and in the way of life to that of Kurilov. Pokhvisnev represents the totally passive element in the present society; he does nothing constructive and spends most of his time pondering over a former non-existent love affair or over the coming annihilation of the whole world. In the flashback to Pokhvisnev's past the former tutor claimed to champion the cause of the peasantry, but in reality was unable to communicate with them (pp. 160-161). His failure in most of the things he had attempted to do is illustrated in his biography; he has never been a successful poet, nor was he ever able to conquer Tanechka's love. Her love was given to another man, the schoolmaster Dudnikov (pp. 166-167). Years later, when the two men met once again, a feeling of mutual hatred bound them together.

Pokhvisnev's failure in love seems to parallel Kurilov's present situation. However, the contrast between the two men lies in Kurilov's active pursuit of love in the present, whereas Pokhvisnev chooses to live in his imaginary world. Although Kurilov pays much attention to the past, his escape route lies rather in the dream of a better future of mankind. This is quite in contrast with Pokhvisnev's vision, such as his nightmare about the moon colliding with

the earth. The uselessness of Pokhvisnev's life serves as a means to bring out the meaningfulness of the life lived by Kurilov and his influence on Alesha's life.

Posle vozvrashcheniya iz Cheremshanska iunyi istorik sobralsia, nakonets, navestit' svoego svidetelia. On ne khotel ulichat' ili doprashivat', a tol'ko vzglianut' v linialye ego glaza: ne sokhranilos' li tam na donyshke kakogo-nibud' otrazheniya sluchaia na Psne... On otyskal dom, i voshel, i pozvonil, emu otper zhilets-vodoprovodchik s namylennoi shchekoi. Alesha sprosil o Pokhvisneve, i tot otvechal, chto nikogda zdes' takogo i ne chislilos'... Nomer doma i kvartiry sovpadali s zapisannymi u Peresypkina. Vodoprovodchik serdilsia, myl'naia pena sokhla u nego na shcheke. Potriiasennyi Alesha ushel ni s chem. Dolzhno byt', nezametnyi starik tak zhe nezametno i ubralsia iz zhizni v svoe besslednoe nebytie...³¹

The chapter "Brat'ia Protoklitovy" tells the story of Gleb's youth and provides another contrasting philosophy of life. Gleb's biography reveals his constant fear of exposure as a former White officer and the source of his feeling of insecurity. This fear is exposed when Gleb receives a letter from an old comrade asking for money:

I vdrug prishlo pis'mo ot priiatelia, chudom utselevshego, kak i on sam. Eto sluchilos' posle togo, kak Protoklitova raskhvalili v

³¹ After his return from Cheremshansk the young historian finally decided to visit his witness. He did not want to expose or question him, only to look at the line of his eyes; whether anything had remained there of the reflection of events on the Psna... He found the house, entered, and rang the bell, and the plumber who lived there opened, his cheek all lathered. Alesha asked about Pokhvisnev, and was told that such a person had never even lived there... The number and the apartment matched with those written down by Peresypkin. The plumber became angry, the soapy foam had dried on his face. The shaken Alesha left with nothing. It seemed that the inconspicuous old man had vanished just as inconspicuously from life into a traceless non-existence (pp. 576-577).

gazetakh za izobretenie batal'onov kolkhoznoi samodeiatel'nosti v bor'be s zanosami. Eto ochen' iskrennee pis'mo... soderzhalo pros'by o prisylke piatisot rublei.³²

The motivation for the flashback is provided by Gleb's visit to Kurilov's office, during which the chief questions Gleb about his past. The only feature which allows Kurilov to make an identification of the son of the tsarist judge who had sentenced him to prison, are his yellow teeth (p. 47 and p. 55). The flashback to Gleb's years of service in the White Army reveals another one of his weaknesses--the inability to suffer and stand firm on his convictions, illustrated in the present by his support of socialism, an ideology in which he does not believe, but which he outwardly supports. With the new threat to his security in the figure of Kurilov, Gleb seeks to sever all ties with his only relative, Il'ia, a respected and well-known surgeon.

Il'ia's hobby of clock collecting ultimately led to his acquaintance with Liza, his future wife. The relevant flashback explains the incident of the broken clock and the reference to Il'ia's wife. The chapter "Aktrisa" reveals the source of Liza's desires and the means she used to attain them. It also exposes

³² And suddenly a letter arrived, from a friend, who had survived by a miracle, just like he himself. It happened after Protoklitov had been praised in the newspapers for his invention of amateur kolkhoz battalions in the battle with the snow-drifts. This very frank letter ... contained a request for five hundred rubles (p. 62).

the origin of her egocentricity and of her desire to play the role of Mary Stuart on the stage.

Each of the flashbacks elaborate on, and clarify, situations as they appear in the fictive present. The characters and relationships as they are sketched in the early sections of the novel are more fully rounded and drawn into a coherent whole. The understanding of the present is to be sought in events that occurred in the past.

Conclusion

From the preceding discussion of the narrative technique in Doroga it is evident that the past is integrated in structure and theme with the action of the present. No completely irrelevant character is introduced in the past; each of the elements in the past contributes to a more comprehensive grasp of the present. It should be noted that this feature ties the novel to the best traditions of novel-writing in the 19th century. While employing a number of modernist techniques, Leonov is absolutely traditional with regard to the evolution and overall depiction of his characters. It is not splinters of life and personality that is Leonov's concern; it is life and personality as a whole.

CHAPTER IV

THE FUNCTION OF OCEAN

Previous analyses of Ocean, as discussed in Chapters I and II of this thesis, have overlooked several important features of the futuric chapters. These will be classified under the following headings: 1) the significance of the title Doroga na okean in relation to the temporal structure of the novel, and 2) the relation of the chapters "Utro," "My prokhodim cherez voinu," and "My berem tuda s soboiu Lizu" to the rest of the novel, in terms of contrasts, parallels, and interrelationships.

1. The Significance of Doroga na okean

The two words, doroga and okean, contained in the title of Leonov's novel are the pivotal points around which the entire novel rotates. All of the action in the three time planes depends, to a greater or lesser extent, on the variation of the terms in their concrete or abstract application to each of these levels.

At the beginning of the novel doroga is associated with the railroad. Kurilov is head of the railroad, and his appearance in an old railroad car emphasizes the importance of the railroad in the present at the very outset of the story. This connotation of the expression doroga pervades the entire action in the present. Every

major character is connected directly or indirectly with some aspect of the railroad: Kurilov, Gleb, Kormilitsyn, Marina are working on the doroga; Liza, Il'ia are indirectly involved because of their relationship with Kurilov and Gleb.

In a similar manner Alesha's historical investigations deal with the past of the railroad. Dudnikov and Pokhvisnev are only distantly connected with the history of the doroga in the past through their link with Blankengagel', the owner of the railroad in the 1870's. Pokhvisnev is the only living link with this aspect of the past.

Doroga in the Oceanic chapters may also refer to a real railroad: "Vsmotrites', eshche nevidanne dorozhnye kombainy steliut put' na vash Okean."¹. But in general the term doroga in the chapters about the visionary future denotes a way of life, a path which leads to Ocean, i.e., the world of the future. Characters, such as Kurilov, Alesha, and Marina, foresee a path to a better life in the future. Kurilov, in turn, influences Liza towards a different way of life, but she does not understand the full meaning of the concept of a "utopia" before his death.

This more abstract meaning of doroga would also seem to be applicable to the present and past in the

¹ Have a good look, some day unheard-of railroad combines will lay the way to your Ocean (p. 123).

sense that it could denote various views of life that are held by the numerous characters in the novel.

Kurilov, Alesha, Efim Arsent'ich, Klavdiia, and Marina exemplify the socialist way of life; Il'ia and Liza are striving to understand and accept it; Gleb, while pretending to support it, essentially rejects the idea; Omelichev recognizes its existence, but is unable to accept it; and Pokhvisnev totally ignores its existence. The concept of "road" in the temporal structure as a whole unifies the content of the novel, both in its concrete meaning of "railroad" and in its more abstract shading of a "path of life."

The concept of Ocean is relevant to the entire temporal structure of the novel. Ocean is Kurilov's dream of utopia, as conceived by him in the past, after reading a book. Ocean is visualized initially as a storehouse of treasures ("khot' i ne ponimal polnost'iu ocharovaniia vol'nykh okeanskikh sokrovishch, . . .")². Later, during his years of service in the army Kurilov returns to the dream of Ocean, but at this point it has not taken its final form, as in the three visionary futuric chapters. "Ocean" in these chapters represents the life of mankind at some future date in a more advanced society, but not the state of perfection. The continuous

²although he did not fully understand the fascination of the free oceanic treasures, . . . (p. 41).

movement of the streams of life in the past and the present towards a more elevated form would appear to be the connotation of okean on these temporal levels.

The narrator of the fictive present presents a definite link with the narrator in the future. The use of the personal pronoun "we" appears in the chapter headings of the visionary future: "My prokhodim cherez voinu" and "My berem tuda s soboiu Lizu." The use of this personal pronoun suggests a personal relationship between the narrator and Kurilov. From these chapters it becomes more evident that the narrator is indeed a friend and has known Kurilov for some time. In the chapter "Stol" he is a participant in the action. Thus, his appearance is justified in the visionary future, and he is the inducement for their journeys to Ocean.

2. The Relationships of the Oceanic Chapters to the Novel

The content of the three chapters dealing with the visionary future presents some startling contrasts and parallels to the action in the other temporal planes. The two most apparent contrasts are: 1) the absence of personal relationships in the Oceanic chapters, and 2) the emphasis on the bright and the new.

A. Contrasts:

The chapters concerned with the past and the present abound in personal relationships and intrigues. The three chapters on Ocean, however, seldom involve the

names of the characters taking part in them. One exception exists in the naming of the generals who lead their men into the battle in the last of world wars--Gregor, the capitalists' general, and Botkhed, the Negro leader who champions the cause of socialism. All other references to people in these chapters are grouped in very general terms. Thus in the final journey to Ocean, the main characters are listed as: devushki "girls" (p. 418), mat' pogibshikh "mother of the ones who perished" (p. 422), and kapitan "the captain" (p. 424).

The emotions ascribed to the people of tomorrow are also expressed in very general, impersonal terms; they suffer and love, but in a different way than in the present. Love is not focused on a single person in the imaginary future as it is in the present or past. This can be shown by an example describing the death of the captain's two sons:

Potom, vse uznali, chto v etom puteshestvii pogibli oba syna smel'chaka... Ia khodil po ulitsam mnogikh gorodov v etot den', i mne kazalos', chto vse devushki mira chuvstvovali sebia vdovami..., kak budto yse iunoshi zemli khoteli stat' ee synov'iами.³

The whole world feels sad, and all the young women experience bereavement, all the young men want to become her (the mother's) sons. Further references to the feelings of the people of the imaginary future

³Afterwards, everybody found out that both of the bold man's sons had died on that journey... I walked along the streets of many cities that day, and it seemed to me, that all the young girls of the world felt widowed..., as if all the young men of the earth wanted to become her sons (p. 422).

are also generalized, as illustrated, for example, in the following excerpt:

Nam pokazalos', chto uluchshilas' samaia chelovecheskaia priroda. Eti liudi derzhalis' priamee i uverennee, ottogo li chto kazhdyi chuvstoval plechom soveda i ne strashilsia nichego, ...nam chasto popadalis' liudi s ozabochennymi litsami. My poniali, chto u nikh byvaet pechal', chto i oni znaiut tragedii, no lish' bolee dostoyny vysokogo zvaniia cheloveka.⁴

People of the visionary future suffer just as man does in the present but in a different way, as the narrator points out.

Another contrast is presented in the elements of hope and novelty of the utopian chapters. "Utro," the first of these chapters, conveys the hope which each new day brings. The road being constructed across the vast expanse of the USSR represents something new and promising; it aims to connect distant points, something which cannot yet be realized in the present. The counterpart in the present is Kurilov's railroad, constantly involved in problems of all sorts.

New technological advances in both war and peace-time in the futuric chapters are further elements which are non-existent in the present or the past. No great discoveries are being made, nor are there many accom-

⁴It seemed to us, that man's very nature had improved. These people stood straighter and more assured, maybe because everyone felt his neighbour at his side and was not afraid of anything, ...we often saw people with careworn faces. We understood that they knew sadness and tragedy, but of a kind more worthy of man's high calling (p. 418).

plishments as far as the railroad is concerned on either of the other two time planes; the opposite is the case, since accidents seem to be a common occurrence on the railroad.

The emphasis on the newness of things and on a fresh beginning is symbolized by the dawn: "Tak nachinaetsia v mechte vsiakoe obetovannoe utro!"⁵. Even though the first two Oceanic chapters stress the war, the tone is one of hope for the future. The tone of the novel in the present emphasizes fall, winter, twilight, and old age. Even Kurilov's Ocean in the chapter "On edet na Okean" conveys the mood of autumn: "Okean byl osennii, trevozhnyi, on starel,"⁶. and Kurilov himself realizes he is aging. Alesha constantly reminds Kurilov that he is an old man as, for example, in the following passage: "Botai, botai menia, starik! ...Ty moi starshii tovarishch,..."⁷. reflects this moods in the present. The action in the fictive present is set in the fall and winter, whereas the action in the visionary future takes place in spring and summer: "my ostanavlivais', brali v gorst' etu tuchnuiu i podolgu, zatumanennymi glazami, smotreli na ee krupinki."⁸.

⁵So every promised morning begins in dreams! (p. 296).

⁶Ocean was like fall, anxious, he [the Ocean] was getting old (p. 43).

⁷Tease me, tease me, old man! ...You are my old friend... (p. 198).

⁸We stopped, took in our hands the fertile earth, and for a long time looked with dimmed eyes at its small grains (p. 417).

Another feature of the Oceanic chapters which is different from the fictive present and from the past is the setting. The action in the present and past takes place in the western-central part of the Soviet Union and occasionally in more remote areas; Ocean, as the capital of the world in the visionary future, is finally placed near Shanghai, and previous action of the wars takes place all over the world.

The choice of the Far East as the setting for Ocean is not surprising when we realize that the whole concept of Ocean emanates from Kurilov, who in the present is continually searching for romance. With the exception of the first railroad wreck in the novel, Kurilov rarely concerns himself with his business affairs. The inclination to dream is justified, however, in the words: "Stroitel' nashego vremeni obrazuetsia iz mechtatelia, a iskusstvo zhit' vsegda slagalos' v osnovnom iz umenia gliadet' vpered."⁹ These words appear in the first of the voyages to the imaginary future. Kurilov has periodically returned to the dream of Ocean before these three journeys with the narrator: both incidents of the recurrence of the dream appeared when Kurilov was imprisoned or had suffered a wound during the war. His last recall to Ocean was shortly before the telegram notifying him

⁹The builder of our time develops from the thinker, and the art of living always arose in principle from the ability to look ahead (p. 124).

that Katerinka was dying (pp. 42-43); hence, the dream of the visionary future is also present and carried forward on the other two temporal planes.

Yet another aspect of the setting and the theme of the futuric chapters which stands in contrast to that of the present is the territory covered by the world wars and the accentuation on the theme of war. The chapters "Utro" and "My prokhodim cherez voinu" are almost entirely devoted to the strategy employed in the war. They are, furthermore, liberally documented with footnotes. At times the footnotes bring out arguments between Kurilov and the narrator. Others are minute "historical documentations," perhaps to add to the credibility of the Oceanic chapters, although its imaginary aspect is stressed by the usage of the term "vision."

The world is the battleground in the struggle between the forces of capitalism and socialism, with the final victory of socialism occurring in the South Pacific, in Oceania. The only rebellions discussed earlier in the present are the Civil War and the peasant rebellion in the 1870's. Both were waged on Russian soil, a vast distance from Ocean. This would appear to indicate Kurilov's desire to free himself entirely from his present situation.

One comment made by the narrator in "Utro" necessitates some further discussion. As an incidental remark the narrator comments: "I kak khorosho, chto

same spasitel 'noe svoistvo pamiati--zabyvat'!"¹⁰. The ability of the mind to forget the past, i.e. those former civilizations and their histories, is not disclosed in Kurilov's relationships with other people. Although Kurilov envisions a bright future and is constantly striving to achieve a better life, he cannot forget the past, as he is continually reminded of it. The name "Protoklitov" at the beginning of Doroga brings back memories for Kurilov, which are thereafter repeatedly reinforced throughout the action in the present. Firstly, he meets Gleb Protoklitov, who introduces an association with the past which Kurilov wants to forget--his experience in a tsarist prison. This, in turn, reminds Kurilov of the beatings he received in prison and bears the implication that his illness stemmed from this (p. 140). His disease in the present forces him to rest and does not permit him to carry out his work.

The people with whom Kurilov is in contact are continually reminding him of the past: Marina, who is writing his biography, is interested in the story of his youth; Omelichev is another reminder of the past; Alesha is more intrigued in the past history of the railroad than its present condition; and Liza is trying to overcome her past, but until the end of the novel, she is unable to do so. All these factors combined

¹⁰ How good it is, that the most redeeming quality of the mind is to forget! (p. 125).

are ever-present reminders of the past; they illustrate the futility of trying to forget.

The narrator remarks in the same chapter that the imaginary tomorrow was more eager for sensations than any other, but that this appeared to be the natural order of things: "To byl naibolee emkii na sensatsii vek, i samaia neozhidannaia iz nikh imela budnichnyi ottenok."¹¹. Yet the time portrayed in the present is also seeking the spectacular, mainly in relation to the past. Marina adopts this position in her interview with Kurilov; she is not interested in the background material which is involved in Kurilov's youth and upbringing, but in his heroic war exploits. Only when Kurilov begins to tell of these experiences, Marina begins to take notes (p. 137). The sensational aspect of life and the sense of the dramatic also appeal to Alesha, who searches the history of the railroad and finds the Spiridon Matochkin uprising there. Liza, too, is strongly attracted to Kurilov because of his "exciting" life. Her passion for acting the dramatic role of Mary Stuart because of its tragedy has been her life-long ambition. This role appealed very strongly to her, until she met Kurilov. As indicated above, sensations in the present and past are extraordinary, while the same sensations in the

¹¹This century had the greatest capacity for sensations, while even the most unexpected of them had an everyday coloring (p. 127).

imaginary future already appear to be everyday occurrences.

B. Parallels:

The parallels which exist between the Oceanic chapters and the rest of the novel relate to the development of the action in the present. The parallel lies in those chapters which precede and succeed the futuric ones, i.e. in the progression of the action. The utopian chapters represent a definite progression: from the beginnings of war to total war, and finally to peace. Preceding chapters represent the various stages of Kurilov's illness: in "Druz'ia" Kurilov suffers his first attack, which he still refers to as lumbago; "Telo" reveals the gravity of his illness, which now is called "hypernephroma," or cancer of the kidneys; the chapter "Kurilov izobretetaet kurs lecheniia" is a momentary impasse before another attack. Each of the chapters preceding the Oceanic journeys, therefore, represent a gradual worsening of Kurilov's attacks. The chapters which succeed the Oceanic travels reflect the growth of Kurilov's love for others and their involvement with him.

"Aktrisa" presents the early signs of Kurilov's interest in other women, although his wife is still alive. During Marina's visit to his apartment Kurilov senses a feeling of friendship for the young woman. This feeling never develops into love, because he meets

Liza shortly afterwards and becomes strongly attracted to her. As he gets to know Liza better, this attraction increases likewise, and he asks her to accompany him to Borshchnia. This trip takes place after the second journey to Ocean and exemplifies the development of love in Kurilov's life. After the third voyage to Ocean, Kurilov and Liza declare their love for each other. This seems to be the zenith of happiness for both of them. But Kurilov cannot attain fulfilment in this newly found love, because he has another attack and is forced to return to Moscow for an operation.

Other elements in the visionary chapters in the novel which have parallels in the other time planes of Doroga and appear as extensions of motifs are the following: war; suffering, tragedy, and death; human traits and conditions and the ultimate disappearance of the past.

The narrator in the first two futuric chapters dwells on the battles fought between the two great powers on earth. The narrative past which is brought into the fictive present by means of flashbacks also reveals stories of war and uprisings, though on a much smaller scale. The peasant rebellion led by Spiridon Matochkin is comparable to Botkhed's leadership in the Oceanic wars. Spiridon's revolt against the oppression of the nobility symbolizes the awakening of the working class in the nineteenth century, as

Botkhed's command symbolizes the awakening of the African and Asian continents.

Throughout the novel one is reminded of Kurilov's suffering and of the tragedy in the lives of some characters, such as in the Omelichev and Protoklitov families. The chapters "Utro" and "My prokhodim cherez voинu" discuss the brutality of war and the agony resulting from it. The third journey to Ocean reflects the elements of tragedy and death in the form of the interplanetary space flight, which returns with only two of its crew members surviving.

Certain features of the present are carried into the visionary future and represent a continuation of human life as it is known in the present.

No, tak zhe kak, sozdavaia bogov, dikar' nadelial ikh chelovecheskimi svoistvami, my ne sumeli sozdat' plemen, otlichnogo ot nashikh sovremennikov. Tam tozhe byli v dolzhnom kolichestve i lentiai, i zavistniki, i duraki... My otmetili ravnym obrazom, chto mal'chishki vsekh vremen odinakovo nesterpimy.¹²

There is also disease in Ocean, as indicated in a newspaper article about a woman with typhus: "...bylo otvedeno mesto dlia interv'iu s kakoi-to nekrasivoi zhenshchinoi, zbolevshei sypnym tifom,..."¹³.

¹² But, just like the savage, when creating gods, furnished them with human qualities, we were unable to create a race different from our contemporaries. There, too, we found lazy-bones, and envious people, and fools in due quantities... We noticed likewise, that urchins of all times were equally unbearable (p. 133).

¹³ there was an interview with some ugly woman, who had been stricken with typhus (p. 423).

Another similarity between the content of the Oceanic chapters with those of the present is the disappearance of traces of past civilizations, personified by some of the characters. Thus, in Ocean, Kurilov and the narrator looked in vain for evidence of past history: "Ne mog ne otpechatlet'sia na nei soedinennyi podvig moikh sovremennikov--zemlekopov, proektirovshchikov, vozhdei!"¹⁴. Apparently, this is something which they do not find except in the conditions of human existence. Similarly, the total disappearance of Dudnikov's broken-down hut when Il'ia walks past the spot a year or so later reflects the vanishing of the past in relation to the present, as does Pokhvisnev's disappearance at the end of the novel when Alesha goes to visit him (pp. 576-577). The extension of some of the features of the present and of the past into the visionary indicate the cohesiveness of the novel as a whole.

C. The function of Ocean:

The visionary future represented by the symbol of Ocean is a means of escape for Kurilov from his problems in the present. Kurilov conceives of Ocean as the representation of the ultimate good, the conditions under which everyone is satisfied. Everything which he

¹⁴It was impossible that the combined progress of my contemporaries, of the excavators, planners, and leaders could not have left its imprint on it (p. 417).

considers as good and praiseworthy is encompassed within the term Ocean: i.e., the future itself is called Ocean; the decisive battle in which socialism triumphs over the forces of capitalism takes place in Oceania; the capital of the whole world then becomes Ocean; and lastly, the spaceship which seeks to conquer other horizons is also Ocean.

However, Ocean is not the solution to Kurilov's problems, since it is not the state of perfection. Kurilov is no more successful in his dreams than he is in everyday life. His illness is not overcome in his dreams; death is present even there. None of the things which Kurilov undertakes in the present are carried to completion: his love for Liza is never realized; his attempt to reform Gavrila is a failure; and Gleb is exposed by his own brother. Moreover, he is not able to overcome his illness in his insistence on postponing the operation which might cure him. The interplanetary space flight is symbolic of his attempt to overcome death, but it is also a partial failure; only two of the crew of four return.

Nor is Kurilov's life entirely negated. He did influence people, as illustrated in the change in Liza's character and the transfer of his dream of Ocean to Alesha. His fear about the process of dying, i.e. his inability to influence the world, is in fact shown to be unfounded. After his death the fact that he was

a success, that he did have an influence on a small part of the world, comes to light.

Conclusion

The central issue of Chapters I and II of this thesis was the invalidity of extrinsic criticism as a criterion for judging the merit of a literary work of art. The extrinsic approach based its assumptions on the direct relationship of life and the content of the work. It failed to study the work in itself and depended upon outside sources for substantiation of those elements which it purported to find. The biographical and intentional frameworks focused their attention on the author, supposedly finding his reflection in certain characters or knowledge of his state of mind when he was writing the novel. In many of the critical analyses, both Soviet and Western, the critics merely referred to the credo of socialist realism and its explicit didactic and political goals. The framework imposed by the formulation of socialist realism proved to be the most limiting in the analyses of Doroga na okean, since it subordinated the content of the novel to political aims and largely ignored its aesthetic aspects. It was found that none of these approaches exhibited a valid judgment on the content of the novel. They could not do so because they sought its meaning and significance in conditions which are outside the scope of the novel.

Some of the critics devoted studies into the intrinsic elements of Doroga, although most of these were rather superficial in character. They studied the language, narrative devices and theme in isolation

from the other elements in the text. The investigations into the language used by Leonov in Doroga failed to provide a firm basis for further study. The studies of the past and of the visionary future usually concentrated on matters of content or emphasized the unimportance of the two in the novel. The futuric chapters, symbolized by the term "Ocean," were most often criticized for their failure to convince the reader of their "reality." The intrinsic studies investigated did not examine the relationship of the two time planes in connection with the present or their overall function in the novel.

The basis for the present investigation of the novel was provided by explicit statements on the past and the visionary future by two Western critics. Struve claimed that the past appeared to have little relation to the novel and that Ocean seemed an artificial adjunct to the story. Simmons stated that Ocean was related to the rest of the novel, but did not subject this statement to a thorough investigation. The point of contention, therefore, was to prove the fallaciousness of Struve's claim and provide substantiation for Simmons' statement.

In a closer examination of the past and of its relation to the present, it was shown that this temporal plane is linked to the depiction of the present without any break in time. This link is provided by such devices as "name dropping," chance and the flashback technique. The flashbacks were shown to be functional in the frame-

work of the novel in the sense that they are closely related to the present. Their main function consists in revealing the causes of the problems that exist in the present, as, for example, Liza's ambition to become a great actress; her separation from her husband; Kurilov's search for love; Pokhvisnev's disillusionment with life; and Il'ia's encounter with Liza and subsequent marriage.

The image of Ocean was examined in the light of the symbolic terms doroga and okean. These terms were found to have both an abstract meaning, such as a "way of life" and "the world of the future," and a more concrete one, such as "railroad" or "road" and the geographic concept "Ocean." Since Ocean took its shape from a book which Kurilov read in his childhood, and developed gradually into an entire concept of a visionary future, it is shown to exist in the past as well as in the fictive present. Moreover, feelings, suffering, and death proved to be present even in this "utopia" of the future, and thus provided a link with the action in the present. The total disappearance of the past in both the present and the imaginary future yielded further evidence that Ocean was integrated in the entire novel. However, as demonstrated by Kurilov's death, the idea of Ocean as a means of escape from death was doomed to failure. Nevertheless, it is being continued in a different form by his adopted son, viz., in the form of the creation of a better future for mankind. The relationship of Ocean

to the overall temporal structure, in particular its complementary nature with regard to the present, can thus be considered demonstrated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abramovich, G. L. Vvedenie v literaturovedenie. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe uchebno-pedagogicheskoe izdatel'stvo ministerstva prosveshcheniya RSFSR, 1961.

Akimov, V. M. Leonid Maksimovich Leonov: Ukazatel' literatury. Ed. L. P. Kozlova. Leningrad: Publichnaia biblioteka imeni M. E. Saltykova-Shchedrina, 1958.

Alexandrova, V. A History of Soviet Literature. Translated by Mirra Ginsburg. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1963.

Boguslavskaya, Z. Leonid Leonov. Moskva: Sovetskii pisatel', 1960.

Bolotnikov, A. "Doroga na okean," Literaturnaia gazeta, April 20, 1936.

Brainina, B. "Roman o doroze v sotsializm," Kniga i proletarskaia revolutsiia, No. 7 (1936), pp. 139-143.

Braithwaite, R. B. Scientific Explanation. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1960.

Comfort, A. The Novel and Our Time. London: Phoenix House Limited, 1948.

E., Ia. "Doroga na okean L. Leonova," Literaturnaia gazeta, Nov. 5, 1935.

Eastman, R. M. A Guide to the Novel. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1965.

Eng-Liedmeier, A. M. van der. Soviet Literary Characters: An Investigation into the Portrayal of Soviet Men in Russian Prose, 1917-1953. 's-Gravenhage: Mouton & Co., 1959.

Erlich, V. Russian Formalism: History--Doctrine. Preface by R. Wellek. 's-Gravenhage: Mouton & Co., 1955.

Forster, E. M. Aspects of the Novel. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1927.

Fox, R. The Novel and the People. New York: International Publishers, 1945.

Gor'kii, M. Sobranie sochinenii. Vol. XXX, Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1955.

Grabo, C. H. The Technique of the Novel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928.

Iasenskii, B. "Ideinyi rost khudozhnika," Literaturnaia gazeta, May 10, 1936.

James, H. The Future of the Novel. Ed. and introd. by Leon Edel. New York: Vintage Books, 1956.

Kovalev, V. A. Romany Leonida Leonova. Moskva; Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1962.

Kovalev, V. A. "Tvorcheskii put' Leonida Leonova," in Leonov, L. Sobranie sochinenii. Vol. I. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1961, pp. 3-29.

Kovalev, V. A. Tvorchestvo Leonida Leonova. Moskva; Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1962.

L., G. H. "Are These Russia's Dreams?" Hartford Courant Magazine, Dec. 10, 1944, p. 12.

Leonov, L. Road to the Ocean. New York: L. B. Fischer & Sons, 1944.

Leonov, L. Sobranie sochinenii. Vol. VI. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1961.

McLean, H. "The Development of Modern Russian Literature," Slavic Review, Vol. XXI (1962), pp. 389-410.

Mendilov, A. A. Time and the Novel. Introd. by Prof. J. Isaacs. London; New York: Peter Nevill Ltd., 1952.

Messer, R. "Doroga na okean," Literaturnoe obozrenie, No. 7 (1936), pp. 20-21.

Muchnic, H. From Gorky to Pasternak. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1963.

Ostrovskii, Iu. "Razgovor dvukh chitatelei o romane L. Leonova Doroga na okean," Znamia, No. 6 (1936), pp. 267-273.

Pertsov, V. Pisatel' i novaia deistvitel'nost'. Moskva: Sovetskii pisatel', 1958.

Romberg, B. Studies in the Narrative Technique of the First-Person Novel. Stockholm: Håkan Ohlssons Boktryckeri, 1962.

Schaarschmidt, G. "Interior Monologue and Soviet Literary Criticism," Canadian Slavonic Papers, Vo. VIII (1966), pp. 143-152.

Schneider, I. "Road to the Ocean," New Masses, Dec. 19, 1944, pp. 27-29.

Selivanovskii, A. V literaturnykh boiakh: Izbrannye stat'i i issledovaniia. Moskva: Sovetskii pisatel', 1963.

Serebrianskii, M. "Doroga na okean," Literaturnaia gazeta, April 24, 1936.

Simmons, E. J. Russian Fiction and Soviet Ideology. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.

Startseva, A. M. "Osobennosti kompozitsii romanov L. Leonova," in Voprosy sovetskoi literatury. Ed. P. S. Vakhodtseva and V. A. Kovalev. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1959.

Struve, G. "The Aesthetic Function in Russian Literature," Slavic Review, Vol. XXI (1962) pp. 418-427.

Struve, G. Soviet Russian Literature, 1917-50. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1951.

Vinogradov, I. "Za sovetskuiu klassiku," Literaturnyi sovremmenik, No. 5 (1936), pp. 141-153.

Vlasov, F. Kh. Epos muzhestva. Moskva: Moskovskii rabochii, 1965.

Voitinskaia, O. "'Doroga na okean' novyi roman L. Leonova," Komsomol'skaia pravda, May 27, 1936.

Wellek, R. Concepts of Criticism. Ed. and introd. by Stephen G. Nichols, Jr. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1964.

Wellek, R. and Warren, A. Theory of Literature. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1964.

Wimsatt, W. K., Jr. and Beardsley, M. J. "The Intentional Fallacy," Ed. R. B. West, Jr. Essays in Modern Literary Criticism. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1962, pp. 174-189.

B29872